National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 86/01)

Canada

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division
Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

0-315-24914-5

178

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

LAURIE SKUBA JACKSON

Date of Birth — Date de naissance	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
APRIL 21, 1955	CANADA

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

7135 SASKATCHEWAN DRIVE
EDMONTON, ALTA, T6G 2A4

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

THE UNCLASSIFIED STUDENT REGISTRATION OPTION:
A CASE IN OPEN ACCESS

University — Université

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
1984	DR. J.M. SMALL

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date	Signature
September 18/84	L. Skuba Jackson

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

The Unclassified Student Registration Option : A Case In Open Access

by

(C) Laurie Skuba Jackson

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF Master of Education

Educational Administration

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall, 1984

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Laurie Skuba Jackson

TITLE OF THESIS The Unclassified Student Registration Option : A Case In Open Access

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED Fall, 1984

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) ....Laurie Jackson....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

7135 Saskatchewan Drive

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

T6G 2A4

DATED September 18, 1984

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Unclassified Student Registration Option : A Case In Open Access submitted by Laurie Skuba Jackson in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

.....James O'Small.....

Supervisor

.....Amy E. Zelan.....

.....Mary J. Dixon.....

Date...September..5,..1984..

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to investigate and evaluate the Unclassified Student registration option which was developed in the Spring of 1982 and tested at the University of Alberta in the 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years. The history of the option was investigated as was its utilization.

Information was sought regarding the students' registration actions, the courses they chose and their demographic features such as age, sex, education, employment, how they had learned of the option, and their academic performance. Students' attitudes and recommendations were also studied and reported.

The research was conducted in three phases. Phase 1 consisted of the analysis of a mail survey which had previously been conducted by the University Senate Task Force on Mature Students. This survey attempted to draw a demographic profile of Unclassified Students and to find what barriers they had previously faced to attending the University.

Phase 2 was a follow-up of a sample of the 1982-83 students by means of a telephone interview. This was to determine the action Unclassified Students took the following year, their attitudes regarding the registration option, and their recommendations. Another part of the follow-up included the investigation of actual University

records to determine academic performance, as well as how many 1982-83 Unclassified Students had returned in 1983-84.

In phase 3 the mail questionnaire was duplicated and administered to all 1983-84 Unclassified registrants. Some additional questions were incorporated to determine their attitudes and recommendations.

It was found that most Unclassified Students were non-traditional, a high percentage were mature students, well over half were female and most were educated beyond high school. Many had previously experienced barriers to attending the University of Alberta, such as a lack of academic qualifications, time constraints, and a lack of self-confidence.

The students overwhelmingly supported the Unclassified option and many recommended various extensions of the current parameters.

Based on the findings, recommendations were drawn which included continuation of the option, and expansion to allow students to study more that one three-credit course' at one time. More promotion of the option is recommended, both internally through Faculty offices and Registrar's staff, and externally through the mass media. Special counselling services for Unclassified Students is strongly recommended, as is the offering of University services and courses during evening hours. It is suggested that traditional admission and registration procedures be reviewed and that all

---

' See note on page 3

University staff be encouraged to develop an "embracing" attitude, as described by Taylor (1982) toward non-traditional students.

Some further research is also recommended in Chapter 6.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are several people whose special assistance to me must be acknowledged. Firstly, Dr. Jim Small who acted as my advisor, acted also throughout my studies as my mentor, offering every encouragement and assistance as needed. I offer him my deep thanks.

I would like to thank also Dr. Amy Zelmer, Associate Vice President, Academic who initiated both the Unclassified program and this evaluation study. I applaud her foresight and her true caring of students. I thank Dr. Zelmer for her cheery assistance in the preparation of this study and for serving on my examining committee.

My appreciation also goes to Dr. Mary Nixon for consenting on short notice to act on my examining committee. I also must thank Dr. Nixon for providing encouragement to me as a brand new graduate student. Her course, being the first in my program motivated me to continue, with zeal.

I would like to thank Mrs. Chris Prokop for her assistance in data analysis, and the University Office of Institutional Research and Planning for furnishing many of the data crucial to the study. The Registrar's office is also to be acknowledged for their assistance in supplying necessary information.

Finally, I would like to offer my heartfelt appreciation to my husband, Martin, for his continual support, encouragement, and true belief in me.

Table of Contents

Page

1. Introduction 1
    - Purpose of the Study 4
    - Research Design 5
    - Overview 10
2. Review Of The Related Literature 12
    - Accessibility of Higher Education 12
    - Barriers to Higher Education 15
    - Institutional Response 18
    - Special Programs or Registration Categories 21
    - Evaluation 23
    - Summary 25
3. Instrumentation 27
    - Phase One Activities 27
    - Phase Two Activities 29
    - Phase Three Activities 32
4. Data Analysis 34
    - Results 34
5. Discussion of Findings 64
6. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations 71
    - Summary 71
    - Conclusions 73
    - Recommendations 76

References 82

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Enrollments by Department	35
2	Age Breakdown	37
3	Sex	37
4	Marital Status	38
5	Highest Level of Education Before Becoming An Unclassified Student	38
6	Unclassified Students Who Had Previously Taken U of A Extension Courses	40
7	How Majority of Time Spent, Apart from U of A Course	40
8	Academic Performance As Compared with Expected	41
9	Grades Reported by Students	41
10	Comparison of Mean Grades of Unclassified Students vs. Others	43
11	Students Who Had Reported Dropping A Course	43
12	Course Withdrawals of 1982-83 Unclassified Students As Compared With Others	45
13	Course Completions of 1982-83 Students As Compared With Others	45
14	Faculties Entered in 1983-84 by 1982-83 Unclassified Students	47
15	Reasons Given by 1982-83 Unclassified Students for Not Registering in 1983-84	47
16	Reasons for Choosing the Unclassified Option	49
17	How Students Learned of the Unclassified Option	50
18	University Barriers for Those Who Had Previously Applied but Did Not Attend	53

Table		Page
19	Situational Barriers for Those Who Previously Applied But Did Not Attend	54
20	Personal Barriers for Those Who Had Previously Applied But Did Not Attend	55
21	University Barriers for Those Who Did Not Apply	55
22	Situational Barriers for Those Who Did Not Apply	57
23	Personal Barriers for Those Who Did Not Apply	57
24	Satisfaction With the Unclassified Experience (1983-84)	59
25	Reasons for Satisfaction	59
26	Reasons for Dissatisfaction, or Unsure	60
27	Recommendations Given By Students	61

List of Appendices

Appendix		Page
A	Phase 1 Questionnaire.....	87
B	Phase 2 Interview form.....	92
C	Phase 3 Questionnaire.....	95
D	Correspondence regarding Phase 3.....	102
E	Age distributions of Unclassified Students.....	104
F	Grade distributions and course groupings from I.R.P.....	106

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Universities in recent years have started to recognize the need to adapt themselves to the changing needs of a changing population. The 1980's have brought an increasing demand for continuing education for non-traditional students, those who are older than traditional, recent high school graduates, those who may not possess traditional university entrance qualifications, those who for some reason in the past faced barriers to entering university. As the population ages, the demand for education increases for the mature student, as it may decrease for the decreasing number of eighteen to twenty year olds. However, in the last four years, there has not been a decline in demand from traditional students in Alberta. Due to bleak employment opportunities, more recent high school graduates than ever want to enter university.

The administration of the University of Alberta in the early 1980's was becoming increasingly concerned with demand pressures from each of these segments. As enrollment figures continued to climb, many Faculties imposed quotas on student places and higher entrance standards overall were contemplated.

Higher standards were adopted for the 1984-85 school term. The minimum high school grade average for application has been raised from 60 percent to 65 percent, and an early admission provision for high school students allows them to apply before final marks are available if they hold a minimum grade average of 72 percent. In addition to the grade requirements, a limit on new first year students has been imposed for 1984-85. Although some specific Faculties have imposed quotas in the past, for the first time the University will limit the total new full-time first year registrants to 4500.

Even in light of the overcrowding problems, however, the Administration did not want to limit enrollment at the expense of the non-traditional student. They recognized, also, a desire in some students to take courses on a casual interest basis, or to "test the waters" before deciding on a Faculty. These students had always been required to go through the full admittance process of being accepted by a Faculty, then registering in a particular course.

Those not possessing full academic qualifications had only one option for an alternate route of entry, the Non-matriculated Adult category. Applicants for this category must be twenty-one years of age and must adhere to the specialized criteria for the Faculty they wish to enter. Minimum grade averages vary between Faculties, as do required high school subjects. Often as a way of gaining entry to a stricter, quota Faculty, non-matriculated adults

would gain admission to the Faculty of Arts with the intention of later transferring to the Faculty of their choice (Senate Task Force, 1983).

Three ongoing needs were proposed:

1. To make U of A credit courses more accessible to non-traditional (adult) students as a means of fulfilling U of A's mandate, to "contribute to the educational and cultural advancement of the people of Alberta at large", and to build support for the institution in the general community.
2. To maintain some "quality control" over the students admitted to courses to ensure an adequate level of classroom participation and to promote effective use of both the students' and instructors' time.
3. To reduce administrative procedures and costs to the lowest level consistent with the above (Zelmer, 1982).

In the Spring of 1982 it was decided to institute a new registration category which would provide open access to all prospective students, allowing them to register in credit courses without the necessity of Faculty acceptance. The Unclassified Student category was initiated in September, 1982 on a two-year trial basis. Students could take up to five three-credit courses,[1] one at a time, before deciding on a program. As no previous scholastic records were required, those students not able to meet the requirements of a quota Faculty could still take courses from those

---

[1] At the University of Alberta, courses are either six-credit (full year) or three-credit (half year).

Faculties while upgrading themselves. A specified list of courses was developed in conjunction with each Faculty, while records were kept by the Registrar's office for possible transferance to a Faculty at some later date, should the student be accepted.

Purpose of the Study

The Unclassified Student registration category was to be evaluated in 1984, after the two-year trial period, in order to decide whether or not it was successful in meeting the ongoing needs stated above. In order to determine the fate of this category, whether it was to be retained, terminated or developed and improved, a profile of the participants was needed.

This study was designed to develop this profile of the Unclassified Students as well as answer the following research questions:

Research Questions

1. How many students registered under the Unclassified category in 1982-83 and 1983-84?
2. In what courses did they register?
3. What are the demographic characteristics of students who registered under the Unclassified category in 1982-83 and 1983-84?
4. How did their grades compare with those of traditional students?
5. What proportion completed their courses?

6. Of the 1982-83 registrants, how many re-registered in 1983-84 as Unclassified Students?
7. How many transferred to a regular Faculty program?
8. What are the future educational intentions of 1982-83 and 1983-84 Unclassified Students?
9. What were their reasons for choosing this registration option?
10. What barriers had they faced to previous university attendance?
11. What were their attitudes toward this registration option?
12. What are the recommendations of these students regarding the Unclassified program?

Research Design

The study consisted of three parts: Analysis of 1982-83 Unclassified Students, Follow-up of 1982-83 Unclassified Students, and Analysis of 1983-84 Unclassified Students.

Phase I: Analysis of 1982-83 Students

In February, 1983, the University of Alberta Senate Task Force on Mature Students conducted a mail survey of Unclassified Students. Three hundred twenty-nine questionnaires were administered in order to determine the demographic characteristics of these students: age, sex, marital status, education, and employment; their reasons for choosing the registration option; their future educational

plans (if known) and previous barriers they had faced to registration or attendance at university.

Phase II: Follow-up of 1982-83 Students

A random sample of 20 percent(n=60) of the 1982-83 students were contacted in a telephone interview in order to determine their attitudes toward and impressions of the Unclassified Student option. They were also asked their 1983-84 educational plans: whether they had returned to the University of Alberta, what Faculty they applied to and if they had been accepted. Those who had not returned were asked to state their reasons, and whether they had any plans to continue their education in the future. Registrar's records were obtained to determine actual re-registrations as Unclassified Students and Faculty registrations.

The University Office of Institutional Research and Planning provided some assistance in furnishing academic records in order to facilitate comparison of Unclassified Students' performance as compared to that of traditional students. Overall mean grades of Unclassified Students were compared to others in the courses they took, then a more detailed analysis of grade comparisons in Arts courses, Science courses, and Education courses was undertaken. These records were also analyzed to determine withdrawal rates for Unclassified Students as compared with traditional students in those courses taken.

Phase III: Analysis of 1983-84 Students

The questionnaire which had been administered to 1982-83 students was revised slightly then sent to all 1983-84 Unclassified registrants in February, 1984.

Demographic features, reasons for choosing the Unclassified option and previous barriers to entry were analyzed and compared with results from the 1982-83 student questionnaires. In addition to those questions asked on the 1982-83 survey, a section was added to determine students' impressions of the option and their recommendations.

Significance of the Study

This project was initiated by Dr. Amy Zelmer, Associate Vice-President, Academic of the University of Alberta to aid in the evaluation of the Unclassified Student option. With the results of this study the University administration will, with a better understanding of the demographics and attitudes of Unclassified Students, be better prepared to plan and improve programs for non-traditional students.

Once this non-traditional mode of entry is evaluated, the information in this study may also be used to make improvements to other University services discussed by the Unclassified students. By taking a consumer-oriented perspective, future planning will facilitate the needs of a greater segment of society. The interest shown in students' attitudes by the University in undertaking a study of this nature contributes also to positive public relations in the

community.

This report will also contribute to the existing, but limited body of knowledge of increasing accessibility to non-traditional students. It is important to document innovative programs and ideas in order that other institutions with similar concerns can benefit from their duplication or adaptation. In the long term, many more universities can provide special programs to enhance accessibility for non-traditional students.

Delimitations

The study included those students who were or had been registered as Unclassified Students as of November, 1983. Phase II included a sample of total registrants only, to gain an understanding of general attitudes prevalent among 1982-83 Unclassified Students.

Analysis of 1983-84 registrants followed as closely as possible the study carried out on 1982-83 students in order to maintain consistency and facilitate comparison.

The study is delimited to information gathered from and about concerned students. It would be beyond the scope of this project to investigate financial and other internal data which should be considered before the summative evaluation is complete.

Limitations

Phase I, the Analysis of 1982-83 Unclassified Students was limited by the use of previously completed

questionnaires which were administered by the University of Alberta Senate Task Force on Mature Students in February, 1982. It is assumed that care was taken to minimize the usual limitations of survey research design.

In Phase II, every attempt was made to minimize interviewer bias, although this limitation normally exists, as does the possibility of non-response, due to mobility or other reasons. The course registration data, grades and completion rates were limited by what was made available by the University Registrar's Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. For security reasons, grades and course averages were grouped, sometimes limiting analysis of performance in specified course areas.

Phase III, the analysis of 1983-84 registrants, was limited by use of the same instrument which had previously been employed. Response rates were affected by the mobility of the respondents.

Terminology

Unclassified Student

An individual who was registered for one or more courses at the University of Alberta under the Unclassified category for the 1982-83 or 1983-84 term. The Unclassified category included students who chose to take courses, but not to register in a particular Faculty, for a variety of reasons, which will be explored.

Non-traditional Student

An individual who, for the reasons of age, or academic qualifications previously experienced barriers to entering university.

Mature Student

A university student who is older than the traditional eighteen to twenty-two year old student, who usually has had some full-time work experience since completing high school. The University of Alberta Senate Task Force (1983) specified the age of twenty-five or over.

Overview

The first chapter of this report includes an introduction to the research, which includes a background analysis of the Unclassified Student category, and the research questions which were addressed and will be answered later in the report. It also includes a description of the research design employed, significance of the study, and delimitations and limitations.

The second chapter presents a review of related literature and pertinent findings in the areas of Accessibility of Higher Education; Barriers to Higher Education; Institutional Response (to the Barriers); a description of some documented programs or registration categories which have helped to increase accessibility, and Evaluation.

The third chapter describes and discusses in detail the instruments used.

The fourth chapter provides the results of the three phases of the study, answering the research questions, which were posed in Chapter 1.

The fifth chapter discusses in more detail the findings and some of the implications therein.

The sixth chapter summarizes the research study, presents some conclusions drawn from the results, and proposes several recommendations based on those conclusions. Recommendations for further research are also suggested.

CHAPTER 2

Review Of The Related Literature

Accessibility of Higher Education

Accessibility, which may be described as providing post-secondary educational opportunity to all those who are qualified and motivated to attend (Alberta Advanced Education, 1984) has become an issue and an objective of educational administrators and governing bodies in the past two decades (Pike, 1978). This objective assumes an equality of opportunity where each individual has the opportunity to be admitted to some post-secondary institution where he can pursue his goals according to his individual ability and desire (Alberta Advanced Education, 1984).

According to MacDonald (1982) the trend in Canada has been toward egalitarianism in terms of broadening the accessibility of post-secondary education to the widest spectrum of society. He adds that the issue of accessibility becomes more pertinent each time there is an economic downturn, when universities and colleges feel pressures to restrict enrollment due to decreasing financial resources. He recommends that access be expanded to bring higher educational opportunities to a greater number of people.

On an institutional level, Brydon (1978) described community college objectives as opening access to more non-traditional students. Vincent (1981) supported the concept of open admissions to colleges in order to ensure accessibility which would illustrate the "egalitarian ideals of American life." Leaf (1979) pointed out that more flexible college admission criteria have produced an opportunity for higher education to students who may have previously been ineligible because of competitive academic standards and McCabe (1981) documented some pressures faced by American community colleges in the late 1960's to remove barriers to admission. He cited the human rights movement as a force which favored the development of an open and egalitarian system where all could gain some certification.

Brydon (1978) quoted Edmund Gleazer Jr. in stressing that to maintain barriers to admission of adult, non-traditional students would be to limit a valuable "untapped potential."

Universities, too, must start to recognize the importance of expanding opportunities to those potential students who have previously faced barriers to admission. J.C. Burkett (1977) charged that universities had previously left equal opportunity responsibilities to the community colleges, while Daniel (1981) described the increasing competition between universities and community colleges. He stressed the need for universities to take a more market-oriented approach, explaining that just as the

railroads wrongly thought their business was railroading, rather than transportation, universities have incorrectly viewed their business as teaching courses to eighteen to twenty-two year olds. Their real business should be education, to all who need and desire that education.

Burkett (1977) described current demographic trends which indicate a "shrinking edge" of full-time, traditional, eighteen to twenty-two year old students. He stressed the need, in light of this diminishing market, to expand opportunities in order to attract the "growing edge" and new majority, the adult, part-time student. Because the population in North America is aging, universities will have to adapt in order to meet the continuing educational needs of older adults (Willie, 1982). Attempts must be made to eliminate the effects of traditional barriers to post-secondary learning opportunities so that every person may pursue the education for which he or she is prepared (Scott, 1978). It has been shown however, that although North American and European governments were committed to increasing equal educational opportunities during the 1960's and 1970's, differences in educational attainment still exist and seem to vary with differences in socio-economic origin, ethnicity, sex and age (Anisef and Okihiro, 1982).

With increasing unemployment, there is an even accelerated demand for higher education among adults, and traditional age-groups alike, placing greater pressure on university admissions. This may result in increasing

selectivity rather than open admission (Stewart and Avery, 1978). Anisef and Okihiro (1982:136) point out that universities in Canada may be in the process of becoming more, rather than less elite due to tuition fee increases and inflation. Still, the university should exercise flexible admission policies in order to provide opportunities to all groups (Brydon, 1978).

Some critics maintain that opening access to universities will result in a deterioration of standards (McCabe, 1981; Leaf, 1979). However, Vincent (1981) and Burkett (1977) strongly oppose this view. Burkett drew an analogy to stress the purpose of the educational institution. He said that if hospitals operated with concern to their standards they would admit only those who would be assured of leaving in perfect health. He explained that universities should concern themselves with quality control during the education process, not the selection of those who cannot fail. Vincent differentiates between an open door policy and a revolving door, pointing out that there is a need to assure meeting of standards after an individual is admitted, not before.

Barriers to Higher Education

Cheney (1980) defined non-traditional students as persons beyond traditional college age or members of disadvantaged minority groups who, in the past, found higher education to be inaccessible. The reasons for this

inaccessibility, or barriers were investigated by several writers.

Pike (1970) and Anisef and Okihiro (1982) discuss environmental barriers which students may face to post-secondary educational opportunity. Pike (1970:7) pointed to problems in the Canadian system with the importance to institutions of intelligence and educability. He stressed that many people have been unable to complete a post-secondary education because of their culture, social status or perceived intelligence.

Anisef and Okihiro (1982:51) identified a number of barriers to higher education including social, cultural ethnic, regional, financial, gender, age, and physical barriers. They supported McCabe's (1981) charge that the social unrest of the 1960's really brought these problems to light. Government response to these barriers has centred around the provision of physical facilities, and student financial aid. Anisef and Okihiro (1982:51) sense a lacking in response to the other factors barring accessibility such as social, cultural and geographic barriers.

Other writers explored the barriers that were perceived by the students themselves. Oski (1980) studied the problems faced by adults who return to higher education after a period of time. She found that their motivation was much different than for the recent high school graduate, ranging from career advancement to personal growth. The largest barrier faced by the adult returning students was one of

self confidence. She recommended, as a partial solution, the absolute need for comprehensive counselling.

Knights and McDonald (1982) also determined self-confidence as a powerful barrier, citing initial anxieties of adult university students. These students were uncertain as to their ability to cope with a university workload as well as maintain responsibilities such as marriage, family or employment. They were found also to question themselves as to their intentions, "Am I doing the right thing", or "Is this really where I want to be?". Kirk (1977) also identified barriers of domestic pressures for married students.

Non-traditional students are concerned about their previous qualifications and academic records, as described by Hartnagel and Union (1981), as well as Bauer (1981). Rachlis (1981) went further to describe this perception as a fear of school developed from past failures.

The red tape surrounding admissions and registrations can be a real deterrent to adult students (Bauer, 1981) who often view the admission requirements as too restrictive (Scott, 1978).

Several writers described barriers associated with restrictions in the availability and times of course offerings (Scott, 1978; Knights and McDonald, 1982; Bauer, 1981; Cheney and Buss, 1980).

Financial pressures were identified as a major barrier by several writers as well. Davis and Johns (1982) recommend

educational policies which assure students post-secondary education regardless of their financial or socio-economic circumstances, while Streeter (1980) felt that the needs of the non-traditional learner in this area are not being met.

Other concerns included transportation, and possible institutional restrictions on age, sex, race or religion of students (Scott, 1978).

Institutional Response

Although the case for more open admissions policies is clear, many institutions only pay lip service to adapting their policies and programs to non-traditional students. Taylor (1982) outlined four possible responses institutions have taken to the diversity of preparation in today's students. Universities can be said to avoid, suffer, cope with or embrace non-traditional students. Although he applauds the embracing attitude where programs are planned specifically for and with input from adult, part-time or unmatriculated students, most institutions pride themselves in only suffering or coping with these students by letting them fit in with existing programs planned for the needs of an entirely different group.

An embracing attitude would mean an equal status, or "first class rather than second class citizenship" for non-traditional students (Hartnagel and Union, 1981). The first step would be to develop an information system to be able to determine the actual needs of these students, rather

than being more concerned only with the needs or constraints of the institution. Without continuous analysis of student characteristics, many decisions are made on the basis of guesswork (Blackburn, 1980).

A questionnaire administered to local community leaders who represent business, unions, and government can help determine what current educational needs are. By asking non-traditional students what barriers they have faced in the past the institution can make a positive effort towards removing them. This open and consultive attitude may also result in more positive public relations in the community, because the public perceives the institution as involving a greater number of people in the educational process (Cheney and Buss, 1980; Groves and Groves, 1980).

The embracing attitude must also modify traditional measures of analysis, to take into account the new conditions and information (Yarrington, 1981). For example, it has been shown that the motivation of the mature student is quite different than that of the traditional student. Many non-traditional students seek career advancement from their higher education, while others look for personal development or challenge (Oski, 1980). Many do not want to complete a degree but want to enroll in college level courses within their interest or job-related area (Sikula, 1979). Keeping these motivations in mind may give entirely new meanings to course withdrawal rates, failure to gain credit or incompletion of programs. Yarrington (1981) points

out that most drop-outs among this group are for reasons of employment, not failure. In fact, employment may have been their goal, so rather than failure, the drop-out has achieved goal-attainment from the institution. Reehling (1980) found a high incidence of program withdrawal among older women. Reasons cited were job responsibilities, lack of time or funds to continue, or illness. She found that many returned to complete their studies at a later time, but also stressed that to this group "completion" may not be the goal. She found that the possibility that they continue after one course was greater than the chance that they drop out after one course.

The second step toward achieving an equal status for non-traditional students would be to institute special programs for their needs. Several writers outline the need for special counselling services for this group (Oski, 1980; Taylor, 1982; Knights and McDonald, 1982; Hartnagel and Union, 1981; Rachlis, 1981; Bauer, 1981). There should be a flexibility of course offerings and times that courses are offered (Burkett, 1977; Knights and McDonald, 1982; Hartnagel and Union, 1981). Admission procedures should be altered by loosening deadlines in order to avoid eliminating the undecided student (Bauer, 1981), admissions offices should be open in the evening to service working students (Hartnagel and Union, 1981), and thought should be given to a "rolling admission" policy since adult students tend to apply later in the year than the traditional student

(Hartnagel and Union, 1981).

Thirdly, if non-traditional students are to feel like a legitimate part of the university, discriminatory attitudes and nomenclature should be dropped. Terms such as "extension" programs or "outside" degrees connote lower standards (Burkett, 1977). Oski (1980) suggests that everyone in the institution be familiarized with special programs so that methods which may differ from the traditional not be viewed as sub-standard. Faculty often perceive adult students as inferior to the traditional students, yet it has been shown that these students do not earn more failure or incomplete grades; performance may even be better (Austin, 1976; Rawlins, 1979). Another misconception of faculty is that adult students who do not declare a major are not serious students. Bauer (1981) suggests that special adult registration categories may be useful for those who are not interested in pursuing a degree.

Special Programs or Registration Categories

In Sweden, there exists a 25/5 program which allows adults over twenty-five years of age with at least five years' work experience to enter certain parts of the higher education system, regardless of other academic qualifications. It was developed because of a need for industry, individuals and institutions to resort to the

universities for professional training, and in 1977 the requirement was reduced to a four year work history. A study of students admitted under this program found no significant difference in academic results between these students and those admitted under the normal regulations. It was also found that seventy to eighty percent did not intend to study for a full degree, thirty percent left without gaining any credits and fifty percent continued to study after the first course. Most were motivated to improve themselves in their careers (Kim, 1979).

The University of Massachusetts at Boston saw the adult student as a viable solution to their declining enrollment problem. In order to attract this group, the university developed a series of public service seminars. These were given at convenient times for working adults in order to encourage applications and to dispel any fears or concerns. Adults were encouraged to take one course as a trial, to test their readiness for advanced education (Hartnagel and Union, 1981).

In New Zealand there is a provision for students over twenty-five years of age, without formal qualifications to be admitted to universities. A pilot program was designed in 1976 to introduce prospective adult Arts students to the University to boost their confidence and see how they could cope with university requirements. The ten week, twenty hour program consisted of lessons taught by a variety of departments from the Faculty, enabling students to "try out"

various subjects. After completion of this program, the success in regular programs was as high or better than regular students (Morrison, 1979).

Indiana University Northwest developed a registration option called the "Adult Non-Degree Student" which is open to students twenty-one years of age or older who have never attended university before. Under this category, students may attain up to twenty-four semester hours of academic credit before committing themselves to a degree program. If they do well, they may then gain formal admission with all completed non-developmental courses applied to the chosen degree program. Most of these students were found to be individuals who did not wish to pursue a degree but simply wished to enroll in college-level courses for personal interest, or for career development. Some of these would not normally have been admissible because of previous academic records, yet their performance was acceptable for passing students. The failure to success ratio for academically unprepared students was 3:1 but this may reflect, in part, their initial motivation of gaining knowledge, rather than credit (Sikula, 1979).

Evaluation

Although educational institutions are facing increasing pressure to be "accountable to their publics," very few actually perform genuine evaluation of their educational programs (Worthen & Sanders, 1973:1). This may be due to the

delicate and political nature of evaluation (MacDonald, 1974:1); the perceived expense (Holley, Matuszek, Curtis, 1979:1) or the confusion and lack of confidence surrounding the decision of what type of methodology would best be utilized (House, 1978:4).

As formal program evaluations began to be justified, most institutions favored very empirical, results-oriented approaches, like that proposed by Robert Stake where outcomes are measured against antecedents or intents (Stake, 1967:112). His model dictated a systematic approach of breaking a program down into its component parts and evaluating each part according to its pre-determined goals. More recently, other more qualitative methods have become popular because of problems in quantifying human studies. These problems were found by House (1977) to include the presence of extraneous variables, experimenter effects, the limitations of existing measurement instruments and the generalization of findings to new settings. Several authors have argued that evaluations should deal with how programs work and how they can be improved, rather than just what they produce (Patton, 1978; Weiss, 1972; Scriven,1980:60). Scriven (1980) proposed a goal-free method of evaluation in order to reduce the effects of bias in evaluation. According to House (1978), goal-free evaluation reduces the bias of searching for prespecified intents in favor of the evaluator being open to discover all outcomes. Scriven proposed it as a useful method of finding out what the program is doing,

without a detailed description of what it is trying to do. Merit is determined by relating program achievements to the needs of the impacted population, rather than to program goals. As such, it is a very "consumer-oriented" evaluation (Scriven, 1980:60).

"Illuminative evaluation" has become a popular type of goal-free study where the primary concern is with description and understanding rather than measurement and prediction (Miles, 1981:480; Parlett and Hamilton, 1972:10). Programs or educational innovations can be evaluated summatively, to help decide on a program's survival or withdrawal, or more importantly, formatively where decisions are made during the program as to what improvements can be made. According to Borich (1977), evaluation functions not only after but during program development. He felt also that the evaluator cannot judge a program's parts without considering the composition of the whole.

Therefore, converse to Stake's directive, most recent studies seem to indicate organic, consumer or needs-oriented, descriptive and formative evaluations of innovative programs in education.

Summary

This chapter has presented an overview of current literature relating to accessibility of higher education, barriers to higher education, institutional response to those barriers, and some examples of active programs or

registration categories which deal with barriers to access for non-traditional students. The last section explored recent findings in evaluation methods of educational programs and innovations.

CHAPTER 3

Instrumentation

Phase One Activities

In February, 1983, all registered Unclassified Students were surveyed by the University of Alberta Senate Task Force on Mature Students. A questionnaire was mailed to 329 students and 147 were completed and returned. This represented a response rate of 45 percent.

Students were asked to respond to questions in three sections: background information, questions relating to the University of Alberta, and questions relating to previous experiences and perceived barriers to attending the University. See Appendix A for an example of the Phase One questionnaire.

The first section asked questions relating to the demographic features of the students: age, sex, current marital status, homemaking responsibilities, number of children at home, highest level of education, whether they had ever taken a University of Alberta Extension course, and how the majority of their time is spent.

Question four, relating to homemaking responsibilities was found to be confusing and was later dropped from the Phase Three questionnaire, and from the analysis. Question

five, relating to children at home was found to be incorrectly pre-coded, so was also dropped from the analysis. It was felt that question eight, regarding how the majority of their time is spent, provided enough information about personal responsibilities and made up for the deletion of the two previous questions.

The second section first asked how students had learned of the Unclassified Student category, and why they had chosen to enroll as an Unclassified Student, rather than in a regular degree program. They were asked also in which term they had taken a course, what grade they had received, whether they had dropped a course and whether their academic performance had been up to their expectations. The last questions in the section asked whether students planned to transfer courses taken as an Unclassified Student to a regular degree program, and if so, into which Faculty.

Section three was more subjective, seeking reasons that students may have had for previously applying to the University, but not attending, or previously thinking about attending, but not applying. Students were asked to rank order a pre-determined list of possible university imposed, situational and personal barriers. It was found that a small number of total respondents answered the questions in this section, and seemed to be confused by the directions, so these also were altered for the Phase Three questionnaire. Instead of rank order, the analysis counted all responses that had been checked and frequencies were drawn.

The data were analyzed by drawing numerical frequencies, and valid percentages which reflected an adjustment for non-response. These findings will be presented in the next chapter.

The 1982-83 students were also analyzed by what courses they had chosen to register in. The University of Alberta Office of Institutional Research and Planning supplied a listing of the courses and the number of Unclassified Students registered in each one.

Phase Two Activities

The follow-up of 1982-83 Unclassified Students was conducted in January, 1984. First, Registrar's records were obtained to find the 1982-83 registrants' names, addresses, telephone numbers and current registration status. Because of the large number that had not re-registered at the University of Alberta in 1983-84, it was felt that a stratified random sample should be drawn for the follow-up interviews. In this way, there would be adequate representation from those 1982-83 students who had not returned in 1983 (71 percent), those who returned and registered in a Faculty (20 percent) and those who returned as Unclassified Students (9 percent). A 20 percent sample or n=60 was decided upon because it would adequately represent the impressions of the entire population, therefore forty-three names were systematically drawn from the list of students who had not returned, twelve from those who were

currently registered in a Faculty and five who had returned as Unclassified Students.

The intended respondents were called several times at different times of the day until they were reached for comment. Those whose numbers were no longer in service were followed up with Edmonton Directory Assistance for new telephone numbers. A large proportion had moved or changed telephone numbers since they had registered at the University in 1982-83. A total of fifty completed responses were obtained. It was felt that this proportion would be adequate in gauging these students' impressions of the Unclassified Category, since the other questions were largely answered by secondary means such as Registrar's data for the entire population.

Students were asked first how many courses they had completed as Unclassified Students, and if they were satisfied with their experience. Reasons were noted. They were then asked if they had applied for admission to the University of Alberta for the 1983-84 term, and if so, their registration status was noted, whether Unclassified or in a Faculty. This section proved to be of limited use in a stratified sample, especially because actual results for the entire population were available. What was useful, however was the portion which asked respondents to state their reasons if they had not applied for the 1983-84 term. It was thought that since this contingent comprised 71 percent of the Unclassified Students from the previous year that their

impressions and reasons could provide valuable insight.

Students were then asked if they had further plans for attending the University of Alberta, or another post-secondary institution in the future. Lastly, respondents were asked for their recommendations regarding the maintenance of the Unclassified registration option.

The interviewing was conducted by the writer with the assistance of two Marketing Research students from the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology. Interviewer bias was minimized by the use of a pre-determined introduction and interview form (See Appendix B). As well, the assistants were trained for two hours in telephone interviewing and performed several practice calls prior to the actual interviews.

The follow-up of 1982-83 Unclassified Students also included an analysis of their grades as indicators of their performance as compared with traditional university students. These figures were supplied in grouped sums by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and were analyzed by means of a T-test to determine the presence of significant differences between the mean grades of Unclassified Students and traditional students in the same courses. Because of the groupings imposed by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, comparison of grades in selected courses was not possible. Instead, comparisons were drawn in Arts courses, Science courses, and Education courses. The Unclassified Student course withdrawals was

also compared to the rate of withdrawal for traditional students.

Phase Three Activities

In February, 1984 the mail survey of 1982-83 students was replicated to analyze the 1983-84 Unclassified registrants. To maintain consistency and to facilitate comparison, the same instrument and analysis were employed, with minor changes.

The physical size of the questionnaire was reduced to be less ominous to prospective respondents. As previously noted, the question regarding homemaking responsibilities was withdrawn and the directions to respondents were clarified and improved. Finally, a fourth section was added to serve the same purpose as the telephone follow-up of the previous year's students, that is to draw some subjective responses regarding the perceptions and recommendations of the Unclassified Students. A copy of this revised questionnaire appears in Appendix C.

In order to improve the response rate over that achieved by the Senate Task Force Study, several strategies were employed. A cover letter was drafted to introduce students to the study and induce them to reply (See also Appendix C). As well, return envelopes complete with postage and return address were provided. Two weeks after the initial mailing of the questionnaires, out of town respondents were reminded by mail to return the

questionnaire, while local respondents were telephoned. Those who could not be reached by telephone were also mailed a reminder. A copy of the reminder is found in Appendix D.

It was found that response was slow because many students were waiting for their first term marks to be mailed from the University so that they could respond to question four in Section Two. In total, 277 questionnaires were administered, 172 were completed and returned, thirteen were returned undeliverable and three were counted as late returns, therefore were not analyzed, yielding an effective response rate of 66 percent. It should be noted that although 340 1983-84 registrants were reported by the Registrar's Office on January 7, 1984, the 277 member registration list was the complete one provided in November, 1983.

The courses chosen by 1983-84 Unclassified Students were also to have been analyzed but any data on these current students was difficult to obtain. The only available records at the time of analysis were statistics provided to Dr. Amy Zelmer by the University Registrar's Office regarding enrollments by department.

Data from Phase Three were analyzed to draw frequencies, as in Phase One. The results, presented in Chapter 4 will provide answers to the research questions posed in Chapter 1, including comparisons of the information derived from 1982-83 students and 1983-84 students.

CHAPTER 4

Data Analysis

This chapter provides answers to the research questions posed in Chapter 1. These answers were derived from the three phases of instrumentation and study described in Chapter 3. The information will be presented under the following headings: Registration Information, Demographic Characteristics, Academic Performance, Follow-up of 1982-83 Students, Future Educational Intentions, Reasons for Choosing the Unclassified Option, Previous Barriers, and Student Attitudes and Recommendations.

Results

Registration Information

There were 329[1] students registered under the Unclassified category in 1982-83, and 340[2] registrants in 1983-84, as reported by the University of Alberta Registrar's Office. This indicates a three percent increase in registrations in the second year of the program and may suggest a marginal increase in awareness of the option.

The majority of courses chosen each year were from the Faculty of Arts, with a large number of students registering

---

[1] Reported on November 16, 1983
[2] Reported on January 27, 1984

with the Departments of English, History, and Political Science. Of the Science Faculty, the most popular course for Unclassified Students was Psychology. Table 1 illustrates the enrollments in both years by department, for those departments registering ten or more Unclassified Students. "<" denotes less than ten registrants in that particular year, therefore are counted as "other".

Table 1
Enrollments by Department

Dept	1982-83	% Total	1983-84	% Total
Anthr	16	3.8	<	-
Class	25	6.0	<	-
E Asian	16	3.8	14	3.5
Econ	<	-	36	9.0
Edpsy	12	3.0	19	4.7
Engl	57	13.7	77	19.2
Geog	16	3.8	<	-
Hist	33	7.9	32	8.0
Music	<	-	17	4.2
Phil	15	3.6	19	4.7
Pol S	38	9.1	20	5.0
Psyco	75	18.0	48	12.0
Romance	11	2.6	11	2.7
Slavics	<	-	10	2.5
Soc	19	4.6	14	3.5
Other	84	20.1	84	21.0
Total	417	100.0	401	100.0

Demographic Characteristics

The average age of Unclassified Students was 33.9 years in 1982-83 and 31.5 years in 1983-84, with approximately 70 percent falling in the "mature" Student category, twenty-five years or over. This reflects a much different profile than the traditional University of Alberta student body, which was reported by the Senate Task Force on Mature Students (1983) to be comprised of only 25 percent age twenty-five or older. Table 2 provides an analysis of the various age groups, and Appendix E contains the detailed listing by age.

The Unclassified registration option seems to attract more females, (59.9 percent and 68 percent) than males, (40.1 percent and 32 percent), the disparity becoming even more pronounced in the second year of the program, as shown in Table 3.

Marital status, as shown in Table 4 indicates nearly equal representation of married and single respondents. Because the choices had to match the 1983 Senate Task Force Study for coding and analysis, the "divorced" category could not be added, therefore there was no way of knowing which response category these people chose. Judging by the high single representation for this age group, it may be assumed that the category also contains many divorced students.

Levels of education obtained previous to becoming an Unclassified Student, Table 5, showed that a high

Table 2
Age Breakdown

Age Group	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
18-24	42	28.6	54	31.4
25-31	37	25.2	52	30.2
32-38	28	19.0	29	16.9
39-45	12	8.2	17	10.0
46-52	17	11.6	9	5.2
53-59	1	0.7	5	2.9
60-66	6	4.0	3	1.7
67+	4	2.7	3	1.7
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

Table 3
Sex

	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
Male	59	40.1	55	32.0
Female	88	59.9	117	68.0
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

Table 4
Marital Status

	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
Single	59	40.1	78	45.3
Married	63	42.9	75	43.6
Common-law	6	4.1	4	2.3
Separated	14	9.5	12	7.0
Widowed	5	3.4	2	1.2
No response	-	-	1	0.6
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

Table 5
Highest Level of Education Before Becoming an Unclassified Student

	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
Some high school	19	13.0	14	8.1
High school matriculation	27	18.5	29	16.9
Some university	26	17.8	35	20.3
University degree	28	19.2	39	22.7
Some college/ technical institute	17	11.6	24	14.0
College/technical institute graduate	29	19.9	31	18.0
No response	1	-	-	-
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

percentage, (68 percent in 1982-83, and 75 percent in 1983-84) had some previous post-secondary experience. Approximately 20 percent already had a university degree. Table 6 shows that most students, 65.3 percent and 73.7 percent, had never taken a University of Alberta Extension course.

Table 7 indicates the major responsibilities and time constraints faced by Unclassified Students. A large majority, 55.8 percent and 59.4 percent work full time, while 16.3 percent and 17.1 percent stated homemaking responsibilities as the major utilizer of their time. Those students who responded to the "other" category stated such responsibilities as taking care of parents and in-laws, being a full-time student, reading, writing or teaching. Two other responses indicated a possible misunderstanding of the question, "How is the majority of your time spent?" Two respondents replied, "Unemployed," while another stated, "Retired."

Academic Performance

The mail surveys of 1982-83 and 1983-84 Unclassified Students indicated that a majority, 54.6 percent and 55.1 percent, achieved the level of performance that they had expected, while just over 21 percent in both years reported performance that was better than they had expected. Refer to Table 8.

Table 9 provides the grades attained, as reported by the students. The very high non-response may have been due,

Table 6
Unclassified Students Who Had Previously
Taken U. of A. Extension Courses

	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
No extension course	96	65.3	126	73.7
One	22	15.0	26	15.2
More than one	29	19.7	19	11.1
No response	-	-	1	-
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

Table 7
How Majority of Time Spent,
Apart from U. of A. Course

	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
Full-time job	82	55.8	101	59.4
Homemaker	24	16.3	29	17.1
Part-time job	18	12.2	16	9.4
Volunteer work	3	2.0	6	3.5
Student at another institution	7	4.8	7	4.1
Other	13	8.9	11	6.5
No response	-	-	2	-
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

Table 8
Academic Performance as Compared with Expected

	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
Better than expected	28	21.6	33	21.2
As expected	71	54.6	86	55.1
Worse than expected	31	23.8	37	23.7
No response	17	-	16	-
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

Table 9
Grades Reported by Students

Grade	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
1	2	3.4	-	-
2	-	-	1	1.2
3	-	-	1	1.2
4	5	8.6	8	9.9
5	8	13.8	12	14.8
6	14	24.2	16	19.8
7	15	25.9	18	22.2
8	12	20.7	18	22.2
9	2	3.4	7	8.6
No response	89	-	91	-
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

in part, to the sensitive nature of the question, but most likely was because most students had not received their first term marks by mail by the time the questionnaire was received in March. Table 9 seems to indicate a normal grade distribution, but without a comparison of the grades of other students in the courses taken, is of limited value for any conclusions to be drawn. For that reason, records were sought of actual grades of 1982-83 Unclassified Students to be compared with other students in the same courses. T-tests were performed to determine the presence of significant differences in mean grades. As shown in Table 10, the mean grade of the Unclassified Students as an entire group did prove to be statistically significantly lower ($p \leq .05$) than that of their traditional counterparts, even though mean scores in some individual courses were higher for Unclassified Students. The raw data on individual course grades is found in Appendix F.

Further investigation into performance in courses offered by the various Faculties showed that the only statistically significantly lower mean was in Science courses, and that mean grades in Arts and Education courses showed no significant differences. It should be noted, however, that the actual difference in means for all courses was less than half a grade point, and for Science courses approximately one grade point. On a nine point scale basis, the educational significance of these differences is minimal.

Table 10
Comparison of Mean Grades of
Unclassified students vs. Others

	Unclassified Mean	Std. Dev.	Other Mean	Std. dev.	T	Prob.
All Courses	5.82	0.97	6.19	0.46	-2.06	0.045*
Arts Courses	5.86	0.99	6.21	0.50	-1.57	0.125
Science Courses	5.04	0.61	5.97	0.38	-2.87	0.021*
Education Courses	6.31	0.83	6.28	0.22	0.06	0.955

Table 11
Number of Students Who Had Reported
Dropping a Course

	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
Did not drop a course	111	79.8	140	82.8
Dropped a course in the fall term	13	9.4	26	15.4
Dropped a course in the winter term	15	10.8	3	1.8
No response	8	-	3	-
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

Another facet of academic performance which was tested was that of course withdrawals and completions of Unclassified Students as compared with others. Table 11 shows the number of students, as reported by themselves, who had not dropped a course (79.8 percent and 82.8 percent), those who dropped a course in the fall term (9.4 percent and 15.4 percent), and those who had dropped one in the winter term (10.8 percent and 1.8 percent).

Once again, in order to draw any conclusions, further analysis of actual records and comparison with traditional students was necessary. Because of the small number of Unclassified students statistical comparison would be misleading. As shown in Table 12, course withdrawals for all courses had a slightly higher rate for Unclassified students at 15 percent as compared with 11 percent with others. Course completions are represented in Table 13. Again the small number of Unclassified students represented in their courses make comparison difficult, but completions were slightly lower at 72 percent for Unclassified students as compared with 84 percent for other students in the same courses. The students who did not formally withdraw, yet did not complete their course were those who received grades of AB (absent), ABF(absent failing), AU(audit), and all other alpha grade-remark combinations, as supplied by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. It should be noted that other students who did not formally withdraw, yet stopped attending classes may have earned grades of 1, thus

Table 12
Course Withdrawals of 1982-83 Unclassified Students As Compared With Others

	Unclassified			Other		
	N	Total	Percent	N	Total	Percent
All Courses	55	/ 417	15	3,371	/ 38,401	11

Table 13
Course Completions of 1982-83 Unclassified Students As Compared With Others

	Unclassified			Other		
	N	Total	Percent	N	Total	Percent
All Courses	235	/ 417	72	33,885	/ 38,401	84

lowering the total mean grade.

Follow-up of 1982-83

Students

It was found that of the 329 registered Unclassified Students in 1982-83, twenty-eight or 9 percent returned in 1983-84 as Unclassified Students, sixty-six or 20 percent were admitted into a Faculty at the University of Alberta, and 235 or 71 percent did not return to the University in 1983-84.

Of those admitted to a Faculty, the majority, 47 percent, registered in Arts. Table 14 provides a breakdown of chosen Faculties.

In the follow-up interviews of 1982-83 students, reasons for not returning were sought. The majority, 45.2 percent, stated the reasons of time restraints due to work or other activities. Responses are listed in Table 15.

Future Educational

Intentions

When asked whether they intended to transfer credits gained as Unclassified Students to another University program, 68 percent of 1982-83 students and 69.5 percent of 1983-84 students replied positively, of those who replied to the question. Ninety-two per cent of 1983-84 students planned to transfer the credits at the University of Alberta and 61 percent chose the Faculty to Arts. Other Universities mentioned were Ottawa (2.8 percent), B.C., Victoria, outside

Table 14
Faculties Entered in 1983-84 By 1982-83
Unclassified Students

Faculty	N	%Response
Arts	47	71.2
Education	7	10.6
Nursing	3	4.6
Science	3	4.6
Rehabilitation Medicine	1	1.5
Graduate Studies	1	1.5
Agriculture	1	1.5
Business Admin. & Commerce	1	1.5
Physical Education	1	1.5
Home Economics	1	1.5
Total	66	100.0

Table 15
Reasons Given by 1982-83 Unclassified Students
for Not Registering in 1983-84

Reason	N	%Response
Time/work/other activities	14	45.2
Lack of interest	4	12.9
Went to another institution instead	3	9.7
Financial difficulties	3	9.7
Health reasons	2	6.4
Course availability at desired times	2	6.4
Self attitude or confidence	3	9.7
Total	31	100.0

Canada (each 1.9 percent), and Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Newfoundland (each 0.9 percent). Other Faculties of interest for transfer were Education (16 percent), Nursing (10 percent), Commerce (9 percent), Science and Home Economics (each 5 percent), Engineering and Law (each 3 percent) and Dentistry and Graduate Studies (each 0.9 percent). It is noteworthy that although 68 percent of the 1982-83 Unclassified students indicated their intention to transfer credits, only 20 percent did so.

Of the follow-up sample of 1982-83 students who were interviewed 80 percent had plans to continue their studies at the University of Alberta at some time in the future, while 26 percent reported plans of entering another post-secondary institution .

Reasons for Choosing the Unclassified Option

The most common reasons given for choosing this option in 1982-83 related to trying out the University, evaluating personal capabilities and boosting self-confidence. In 1983-84, the most common reasons given were the desire to take a course for interest, and because students were too late for regular application. Many of these were transfers from other institutions and were not aware of or could not meet regular program deadlines. Table 16 outlines the range of responses.

It was found that in 1982-83 the majority of registrants (57.7 percent) had heard of the option through

Table 16
Reasons for Choosing the Unclassified Option

	1982-83 N	1982-83 %Response	1983-84 N	1983-84 %Response
Lacked courses, prerequisites or transcripts	20	19.2	23	13.4
Too late for regular application	22	21.2	40	23.3
Wanted a course for personal interest	29	27.9	41	23.8
To try out the University	33	31.7	29	16.9
Uncertain of what Faculty	-	-	20	11.6
Easier registration	-	-	12	7.0
Transfer credits for another University	-	-	7	4.0
Total	104	100.0	172	100.0

Table 17
How Students Learned of the Unclassified Student Option

	1982-83 N	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 N	1983-84 Valid %
Newspaper	82	57.7	16	9.4
Word of mouth	21	14.8	38	22.4
U. of A. publication	6	4.2	20	11.8
Registrar's Office	24	16.9	76	44.7
Other	9	6.3	20	11.8
No response	5	-	2	-
Total	147	100.0	172	100.0

the newspaper, while in 1983-84, word of mouth (22.4 percent) and the Registrar's office (44.7 percent) were the most common sources of information. This is probably attributable to the fact that more people, including the Registrar's staff would be aware of the program in its second year. Being a new program in 1982-83, newspaper advertising was used extensively to introduce students to the option. Table 17 provides a detailed analysis. "Other" responses included the University Student Counselling Office, Employer, U. of A. Extension "Second Look" Course, Radio Talk Show, and the Faculty Offices of Arts and Nursing.

Previous Barriers

The mail questionnaire which was administered to both years' Unclassified Students attempted to uncover some of the reasons these students had not attended the University of Alberta previously, under traditional entry means. Students were asked to respond to questions in one of two sections : (1) those who had previously applied to the University but did not attend, and (2) those who thought about attending, but did not apply. They were asked to note barriers which had applied to them, under the headings of University Imposed, Situational, and Personal Barriers.

The most common University barrier, stated by 20.9 percent of 1982-83 students and 20.4 percent of 1983-84 students who had previously applied, but never attended was that they had not met admission requirements. The second

most common (14.0 percent and 12.2 percent) was a stated difficulty in transferring credits from another university or college. The full range of responses to perceived University imposed barriers for those who had previously applied, but had never attended is found in Table 18.

The most common situational barriers, shown in Table 19, for this group were time pressures (27.9 percent for 1982-83 and 29.0 percent for 1983-84), balancing multiple responsibilities (30.2 percent and 18.4 percent) and financial difficulties (20.9 percent and 23.7 percent). Those who had previously applied stated personal barriers of, primarily, a concern about their academic competence (39.3 percent and 38.0 percent), and secondly, lack of confidence (21.4 percent and 27.6 percent). Other responses are also presented in Table 20.

Many more students replied to the section for those who had previously thought about attending the University of Alberta, but had never applied. Table 21 displays the range of responses to perceived university barriers to those who did not apply. The most common barrier stated by students from both years was a concern about admission requirements, (31.8 percent in 1982-83 and 32.4 percent in 1983-84). A fairly large number (14.1 percent and 17.1 percent) felt that the course offerings were inadequate and 16.5 percent and 10.5 percent were concerned about gaining credits for coursework completed at another institution.

Table 18
University Barriers for Those Who Had Previously Applied But Did Not Attend

	1982-83 Count	1982-83 %Response	1983-84 Count	1983-84 %Response
Did not meet admission requirements	9	20.9	10	20.4
Difficulty obtaining info. from University	4	9.3	5	10.2
Inadequate academic counselling	6	14.0	5	10.2
Inadequate choice of courses	3	7.0	3	6.2
Rigid residency requirements	-	-	1	2.0
Registration difficulties	6	14.0	5	10.2
Difficulty with Transfer credits	6	14.0	6	12.2
Not accepted to quota faculty	5	11.5	4	8.2
Other	4	9.3	10	20.4
Total	43	100.0	49	100.0

Table 19
Situational Barriers for Those Who
Previously Applied But Did Not Attend

	1982-83		1983-84	
	Count	%Response	Count	%Response
Time pressures	12	27.9	11	29.0
Multiple responsibilities	13	30.2	7	18.4
Financial difficulties	9	20.9	9	23.7
Health problems	-	-	2	5.3
Unavailability of Child care	-	-	1	2.6
Transportation Difficulties	3	7.0	1	2.6
Lack of encouragement	1	2.3	3	7.9
Disruption of family life	1	2.3	1	2.6
Other	4	9.3	3	7.9
Total	43	100.0	38	100.0

Table 20
Personal Barriers for Those Who Previously Applied But Did Not Attend

	1982-83 Count	1982-83 %Response	1983-84 Count	1983-84 %Response
Lack of motivation	5	17.9	7	24.1
Lack of confidence	6	21.4	8	27.6
Feelings of isolation	2	7.1	2	6.9
Concern about academic competence	11	39.3	11	38.0
Other	4	14.3	1	3.4
Total	28	100.0	29	100.0

Table 21
University Barriers for Those Who Did Not Apply

	1982-83 Count	1982-83 %Response	1983-84 Count	1983-84 %Response
Concern about admission requirements	27	31.8	34	32.4
Difficulty obtaining info. from University	10	11.8	7	6.7
Difficulty obtaining info. from Faculties	7	8.2	9	8.6
Inadequate course choices	12	14.1	18	17.1
Cumbersome registration	7	8.2	14	13.3
Credit from other institution	14	16.5	11	10.5
Other	8	9.4	12	11.4
Total	85	100.0	105	100.0

Situational barriers faced by this group are presented in Table 22. These varied between 1982-83 and 1983-84, with the most common in the first year being the balancing of multiple responsibilities, (27.0 percent) while the most common barrier in the second year was transportation difficulty (26.8 percent). The 1982-83 respondents also stated time pressures as a major barrier (24.0 percent) and financial difficulties (19.0 percent), while the 1983-84 respondents chose multiple responsibilities (16.8 percent), health problems and lack of encouragement from family and peers (12.4 percent each).

The most common personal barrier stated in both years of the study with 36.8 percent response was a concern about academic competence. Table 23 shows that other concerns were a lack of confidence (23.5 percent and 26.4 percent) and a lack of motivation (16.2 percent and 26.4 percent).

Student Attitudes and Recommendations

A sample of the 1982-83 Unclassified Students were asked in the telephone survey about their attitudes and recommendations. Of the forty-six students who replied to the question, forty-three or 93.5 percent were satisfied, and only three or 6.5 percent were not. Reasons stated for satisfaction were that students had a chance to try out a course at the University, or to take a course for interest only and not degree credit. Reasons given by those who were not satisfied were a problem with hearing, and a lack of

Table 22
Situational Barriers for Those Who Did Not Apply

	1982-83 Count	1982-83 %Response	1983-84 Count	1983-84 %Response
Time pressures	24	24.0	12	5.8
Multiple responsibilities	27	27.0	35	16.8
Financial difficulties	19	19.0	11	5.3
Health problems	1	1.0	26	12.4
Unavailability of Child care	1	1.0	22	10.5
Transportation Difficulties	5	5.0	56	26.8
Lack of encouragement	6	6.0	26	12.4
Expected disruption of family life	13	13.0	3	1.4
Other	4	4.0	18	8.6
Total	100	100.0	209	100.0

Table 23
Personal Barriers for Those Who Did Not Apply

	1982-83 Count	1982-83 %Response	1983-84 Count	1983-84 %Response
Lack of motivation	11	16.2	23	26.4
Lack of confidence	16	23.5	23	26.4
Expected feeling of isolation	7	10.3	6	7.0
Concern about academic competence	25	36.8	32	36.8
Other	9	13.2	3	3.4
Total	68	100.0	87	100.0

adequate counselling and information.

The 1983-84 students also replied favorably in their questionnaire survey. As Table 24 shows, over 83 percent were satisfied with their experience. The most common reasons, other than those relating to the course or professor were that students felt they could "try out" the University (19.0 percent), the course(s) provided a challenge and boosted their confidence (13.8 percent) and students could try out courses before deciding on a Faculty (12.9 percent). The range of reasons stated are presented in Table 25.

Of the 1983-84 Unclassified students, only twenty-seven or 16.6 percent were dissatisfied or unsure. Their reasons appear in Table 26. Forty-six percent of these twenty-seven related their dissatisfaction to the course material or professor rather than to the experience particularily as an Unclassified Student. The most common personal reason was a feeling of isolation (21.6 percent) and several students made additional comments relating to their age as being a factor in feeling "different." Other people stated problems in obtaining information about the Unclassified category or other University procedures (8.1 percent), while two students in this group complained that certain Faculties or Departments would not recognize courses taken as an Unclassified Student.

When asked whether the Unclassified Option should be maintained, forty-seven or 94 percent of the 1982-83

Table 24
Satisfaction With the Unclassified Experience(1983-84)

	N	Vaild %
Very satisfied	57	35.0
Satisfied	79	48.5
Unsure	12	7.4
Dissatisfied	12	7.4
Very dissatisfied	3	1.8
No response	9	-
Total	172	100.0

Table 25
Reasons for Satisfaction

	Count	%Response
Reasons related to the course or professor	30	25.9
Saw what the U. of A. was like	22	19.0
Could try a course before deciding on Faculty	15	12.9
Staff/administration helpful	5	4.3
Ease of registration/less red tape	12	10.3
Provided a challenge/boosted confidence	16	13.8
Could take a course just for interest	5	4.3
Was accepted and treated as a regular student	6	5.2
Flexibility	3	2.6
No obligation to pay students union fees	2	1.7
Total	116	100.0

Table 26
Reasons for Dissatisfaction, or Unsure

	Count	%Response
Related to the course or professor	17	46.0
Related to university policies or procedures	5	13.5
Feelings of isolation	8	21.6
Problems in advice from Registrar or Faculty	3	8.1
No athletic privileges	1	2.7
Too expensive	1	2.7
Student was unprepared or confused	2	5.4
Total	37	100.0

Table 27
Recommendations Given By Students

	Count	%Response
More selection of courses (some specified areas)	25	25.5
Allow students to take higher level courses	5	5.1
Allow students to take more than one course at time	17	17.3
Extend allowable limit of courses	5	5.1
Offer more courses in evening, spring & summer	18	18.4
More counselling and assistance to Unclassified	12	12.3
Allow use of all campus facilities (phys. ed)	5	5.1
Provide more information to the Registrar, Faculties and general public	11	11.2
Total	98	100.0

students sampled replied positively, one negatively and two were undecided. Of the 172 1983-84 students surveyed, 94 percent favored retention, 3 percent were negative and 3 percent were unsure.

When asked for recommendations, many students chose to reply. A listing of these is presented in Table 27. Twenty-five of the ninety-eight responses recorded related to an extension of the number of courses offered to Unclassified Students. Some students specified areas or departments of interest such as Science, Home Economics, Business Administration. Eighteen students asked for more courses to be offered at convenient times for working individuals, such as evenings and in the intersessions. Seventeen students recommended that students be allowed to take more than one course at a time, and five asked to be able to take higher level courses. Information seemed to be a concern, both that provided to students, and to others. Twelve students replied that Unclassified Students should have more counselling or assistance, while eleven others stated a need for further information dissemination to the Registrar's office staff, Faculty office staff and the general public regarding the Unclassified Option. Five students recommended an extension of the allowable limit of courses taken, and five requested the use of campus facilities such as Physical Education, Health Services and libraries.

This chapter has presented an analysis of data derived from the three phases of study and answered the research questions which were presented in Chapter 1. The next chapter will discuss these findings. Summary, conclusions and recommendations will be presented in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion of Findings

The study's purpose was to provide information to the University of Alberta Administration on Unclassified Students in order to facilitate an evaluation of the registration category. It is suggested throughout the literature, reviewed in Chapter 2, that universities must become more flexible and responsive to the needs of non-traditional students. This was obviously the mandate of the University of Alberta Administration when they developed a category which would admit students without prior academic records to study a course for personal interest or prior to committing to a Faculty.

In order to make recommendations as to the fate of this program, information regarding attendance, demographic profiles, and some student attitudes were required.

Registration Information

The registration data presented in the previous chapter suggested an increase in popularity of the Unclassified option over the two years it had been offered. It was also found that more students had learned of the option in the second year by means of word of mouth either by personal contacts, or University personnel. The option is gaining

awareness, and probably will become immensely more popular if retained in the future. It was found informally by the writer that very few current, traditionally registered students, staff or general public have heard of this option. When explained to them, all have responded very positively. It would seem, from personal experience and from recommendations of Unclassified Students, that although awareness is increasing, more promotion may be necessary.

Of the students who did register in the Unclassified category, most chose Arts courses, and also stated a preference for the Arts Faculty when they considered traditional registration. This may suggest an interest in the humanities for mature students who return to school after a period of time.

Student Characteristics

The Unclassified Students tend to be mature, with 70 percent being twenty-five years or over. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this compares with 25 percent of traditional students in this age bracket. The University must recognize the specialized needs of this older population. Stated problems were feelings of isolation, disrespect by University staff, difficulty hearing and the need for specialized counselling.

Most students of this group held full time employment while studying part-time to improve themselves. An increase in part-time students also reflects a need for responsiveness on the part of the University to provide

courses, services, counselling and administration during hours which are more convenient to this segment.

Many of these students were female and may be divorced and/or single parents, with numerous time pressures, multiple responsibilities, yet a desire to improve themselves. They are to be admired and respected as a specialized group and should not, as stated in the literature review, be ignored with the wish that they quietly assimilate themselves into a system designed for the needs of a much different group.

These students have shown themselves to already be better educated than the traditional entering student, and have proved their academic competence. Over 75 percent reported performance as good as or better than expected, and actual records show that their grades do not vary greatly from those of other students, except in Faculty of Science courses. This may be due to the fact that as older students, their mathematics and scientific backgrounds that were sufficient five to ten years ago, have comparatively declined with today's technological changes. This concept has been recognized by Knights and McDonald (1982) who found that instructional approaches in this area have changed more rapidly than in the humanities, therefore older students may have trouble with the level of previous knowledge required.

Course completions were lower than for other students, yet formal withdrawals show no significant difference. This may be a function of the combination of low self-confidence

which was shown to be a significant attitudinal factor of these students, lack of knowledge of formal procedures or deadlines regarding withdrawals, and lack of interest in obtaining course credits. It should be remembered that a student's failure to write a final examination should in no way label him as a less serious student than the traditional. As pointed out by Yarrington (1981), their goals are probably different therefore fulfilled by the learning experience and not by formal completion of the course. It must also be pointed out that the Unclassified category was designed as a "trial" vehicle. If students are using it as such, then it is to be expected that some will attend, then decide that University was not what they had expected or desired. It would seem preferable to house these "trial" students in a special category rather than having them take up places in Faculties they may not be suited for, only to drop out, discouraged, before the end of the term.

Student Attitudes

Previous barriers to University attendance tended to support those found in the literature. Lack of confidence, concern about admission requirements and time constraints due to job-related or family responsibilities were common characteristics. The Unclassified option appears to have removed some of those barriers, as students reported such reasons for choosing the option as lack of course prerequisites or transcripts of previous study, and a chance to try out the University to boost their self confidence or

personal development. The most common reasons given for satisfaction with their experience also related to the ability to try out the University, to try courses before deciding on a Faculty program, and a boost in self-confidence.

The option was designed, as stated, to facilitate trial, to increase access for traditionally academically unprepared mature students, and to provide a means for the public to take courses for interest rather than as partial fulfillment of degree requirements. Other uses found were that some students had been too late for regular registration, wanted easier registration or wanted to gain course credits which could be transferred to another university. These may not be considered by some as legitimate reasons to be considered, but upon further investigation, may prove to be as important as the other reasons.

It was found that of those students who were too late for regular application, most had not been aware of application deadlines, others perhaps had not considered attending months before the commencement of classes, while several had been from other cities and actually were unable to meet traditional application dates. It would seem that the later application deadline may serve a real need for students who might not otherwise be able to attend the University. One student provided the comment, "It was a godsend; I had just moved into town and would not have been

able to come until next term."

Many students registering in the second year of the program were attracted by the news of the easier registration procedures. The Senate Task Force (1983) recognized the registration procedure as one of the most serious difficulties facing mature students and recommended a more simplified and flexible system. The result in this study would seem to support that recommendation.

A small number of students chose the Unclassified option in order to be able to take a course to later transfer credit to another university. This should be seen as a positive use which provides the exchange of ideas between institutions. Most of these students were in Edmonton temporarily while registered at another university and saw the opportunity to gain a new perspective, perhaps, in their chosen field of study.

As discussed in the previous chapter, 93.5 percent of the 1982-83 students sampled and 83.5 percent of 1983-84 students expressed satisfaction with their experience as Unclassified Students. Some seemed to misinterpret the question somewhat because they related it to their entire experience at the University rather than just as an Unclassified student, and rated their courses or professors. It is interesting to note that a greater proportion, 94 percent in both years, favored retention of the option. This may illustrate that although some students were dissatisfied or unsure, they recognized personal problems and still

recommended the registration category as a viable vehicle for other people.

Summary

This chapter has provided discussion of and further insight into the results presented in Chapter 3. The next chapter summarizes the entire study and provides some recommendations based on these findings.

CHAPTER 6

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

The study attempted to provide an illuminative evaluation of the Unclassified Student registration option. Information was sought regarding the students' registration choices over the two trial years of the program, their demographic features and their attitudes and recommendations regarding open access registration.

The research was conducted in three phases. First, 1982-83 Unclassified Students were surveyed by mail by the University Senate Task Force on Mature Students. These data were compiled and analyzed to determine a profile of the 1982-83 students. Secondly, a follow-up of a sample of these students was conducted in 1984 by means of telephone interview in order to explore their actions after being an Unclassified Student and to determine their attitudes toward the program. Thirdly, the mail questionnaire from the first phase was replicated and administered to the second wave of students, those registered in 1983-84. Some additional questions were incorporated to determine the attitudes and recommendations of the 1983-84 students.

In addition to the direct survey research, secondary sources, such as the University of Alberta Registrar's Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning provided statistics on grade averages and course completions for Unclassified Students as compared with others in the same courses. They also provided registration information such as numbers of students registered, courses registered in, and registration status in 1983-84 of the previous year's Unclassified Students.

These procedures were implemented in order to answer the research questions noted below, so that an evaluation and subsequent recommendations, could be forwarded regarding the Unclassified Student registration category.

1. How many students registered under the Unclassified category in 1982-83 and 1983-84?
2. In what courses did they register?
3. What are the demographic characteristics of students who registered under the Unclassified category in 1982-83 and 1983-84?
4. How did their grades compare with those of traditional students?
5. What proportion completed their courses?
6. Of the 1982-83 registrants, how many re-registered in 1983-84 as Unclassified Students?
7. How many transferred to a regular faculty program?
8. What are the future educational intentions of 1982-83 and 1983-84 Unclassified Students?

9. What were their reasons for choosing this registration option?
10. What barriers had they faced to previous university attendance?
11. What were their attitudes toward this registration option?
12. What are the recommendations of these students regarding the Unclassified program?

Conclusions

The Unclassified option was widely accepted by those prospective students who had heard of it through newspaper advertisements, the University of Alberta Registrar's Office, Faculty offices or other sources. It appealed to those who had previously perceived barriers to attending the University of Alberta, such as admission requirements, lack of self-confidence, time constraints because of employment or other responsibilities, difficulty with transferring credits earned at other institutions, and generally a concern about their academic competence. It attracted students who wanted to take courses for interest or personal development, rather than for degree credit, and those who were as yet unsure of what degree to pursue. In its second year the option attracted part-time students who had heard that the registration procedure was much simpler, and it attracted students who had missed regular admission deadlines. As shown in the previous chapter, these should

not be dismissed as unimportant reasons, but considered quite legitimate. These factors may show a very real need for more flexible admission deadlines and for a less complicated registration procedure.

A large number of the Unclassified Students were twenty-five years or over, worked full-time and had other responsibilities, such as family. Many already had completed some post-secondary education.

Although several of these students had lacked academic standards for admission in the past, largely their performance was comparable to other students, in Arts and Education courses. Some courses, such as Math and other Science courses showed grades that were significantly lower, but again it should be pointed out that as a registration category the Unclassified option was designed to permit trial by the prospective student. More would be expected to fail or withdraw than traditional students who are screened more rigorously and who ostensibly know they are pursuing a particular degree with a goal in mind.

The barriers previously perceived seemed to have been alleviated by the Unclassified category because the students overwhelmingly supported its continuation. Those who were not satisfied seemed to experience problems with their professors, administrative procedures or personal feelings of isolation. These may be serious problems which also need to be addressed, but probably did not relate solely to their registration category.

Overall, the Unclassified Student registration option proved to be a valuable tool in increasing accessibility to non-traditional students, many of whom might not otherwise have been able to attend the University. It was viewed by the students as a very positive step taken by the University to become more responsive to the needs of a wider public.

On the negative side, increasing accessibility indiscriminately may be viewed as compromising academic standards and increasing enrollment in an already over-crowded institution. It may be argued, however, that standards must be maintained after entry, and that those with the need and desire to learn are those that should be admitted. It was shown through this study that many students succeeded academically, and in fact surpassed their expectations, who otherwise would not even have been admitted because of previous academic performance. The job of the University is to educate those with the desire for higher education.

Overcrowding is a tangible problem which must be addressed, but should not be dealt with at the expense of those students whose only faults are that they are older, or from other institutions, or do not desire a degree, or do not possess traditional qualifications. If more students were encouraged to take a term or more for trial as Unclassified Students then perhaps more "weeding out" of less serious students could be done at this level, before they take up places in Faculties.

The University of Alberta Administration has taken a positive step in opening access, but it should go a step further to provide the atmosphere described by Taylor (1982) as embracing to non-traditional students. These students must be viewed as first class, rather than second class citizens of the University, where courses and programs are planned with them in mind, rather than requiring them to fit into the existing system. Several recommendations are suggested in the following section.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions of this study. Some, it should be acknowledged, concur with those posed by the University of Alberta Task Force on Mature Students (1983). Many of these recommendations arise from expressed points of view of Unclassified Students and are presented in that light. The full implications of implementation from the University's point of view have not been explored.

1. There is no question that from the perspective of this study the Unclassified Student registration category should be maintained in order to provide open access to non-traditional students.

2. It is recommended that the category be expanded to allow students to take more than one half course in any one term. As many students are otherwise unemployed, they

may easily be able to handle up to five half courses, whether for general interest or as preparation for another University program.

3. Students should be encouraged, but not limited, to take junior level courses. Especially where older students have been away for five or more years, 100 level Mathematics and other Science courses may be indicated.

4. Faculties should be urged to designate more courses as available to Unclassified students. These should include senior as well as junior level courses for those students who demonstrate an interest and aptitude.

5. After completing five three-credit courses, those students wishing to pursue a degree should be counselled to apply to the Faculty of their choice. If extended beyond five courses without specialized counselling, problems in the future may arise with regard to students having several courses which may not be acceptable as fulfillment of the requirements for the degree they seek. This could cause administrative difficulties and hard feelings among students who find themselves with credits they can't "use."

6. More prospective students should be encouraged to utilize this option and it should continue to be widely promoted. It should be recommended to those students who are unsure of what Faculty to enter, as well as to those

who appear to lack academic qualifications. Every Faculty office should be made aware of the option and encouraged to promote it. Care must be taken that every staff member in the office be informed, to maintain consistency in advice students receive.

7. The Unclassified student route should be considered a valid entry mode to a Faculty for those students who previously did not have academic qualifications yet have displayed their competence in handling University level courses. As such, this option could take the place of the current Non-Matriculated Adult status.

8. Continued promotion to the general public is recommended through such media as radio and television talk shows, and press releases, reducing the cost of paid advertising.

9. Special counselling services should be provided and should be mandatory for Unclassified Students seeking to go beyond the normal five course maximum. Counsellors could act as liaison between these students and departmental and Faculty offices on such issues as prerequisites, approvals for senior-level courses and applications for admission. Counsellors could provide information necessary to new students regarding student services, policies and procedures and course recommendations. It is imperative that these counsellors be educated in issues which are of concern to mature, or

other non-traditional, part-time students. Preferably, they would be older themselves and experienced in part-time study. McCabe (1981) showed that gains in student performance are evident where these services are available.

10. It is recommended that current admissions policies be reviewed with the consideration of loosening application deadlines. Perhaps a more flexible system could be instituted which would allow later applications for any program which had not been filled by the traditional deadline date. It is recommended further that the deadlines for application for Unclassified Students remain as designed.

11. More credit courses in all Faculties should be offered during evening hours. Other alternatives of meeting the needs of working students which should be explored are the possibilities of weekend seminar courses, late afternoon (4:30 pm.) or early morning (7:00 am.) classes or other combinations for which there may be sufficient demand.

12. In addition to classes, other services should be made available to students who cannot take advantage of them during working hours. Services such as Registrar's and Comptroller's offices, bookstore, counselling, libraries, parking and departmental offices should be open at least one evening per week, and during some time

on the weekend, for instance Saturday morning until noon. Also, staff rotation could easily facilitate opening during the noon hour.

13. Unclassified Students should possibly be given the option of paying additional fees for the use of physical education and students' union facilities, as well as health services.

14. The final recommendation is slightly less tangible than those preceding. When adopting an "embracing" attitude toward non-traditional students, the entire University must become more consumer-oriented. The commitment must come from all staff, not just the top administrative offices. This translates into a recommendation for an internal promotional effort geared toward the understanding and acceptance of non-traditional students. All University staff need to be reminded that their entire purpose, directly or indirectly, revolves around the education of students. Students, both traditional and non-traditional, need to be viewed as the primary factor of the University, not a necessary evil, to be tolerated at best. Mature students, especially, are used to being treated with respect on the job and in other facets of their lives. This should be possible also in over-the-counter dealings with University personnel.

Further Research

The results, conclusions and recommendations of this study have given rise to some further questions which may be investigated in the future. It may be beneficial to elicit faculty response to the Unclassified student option. It would be interesting to interview professors to determine their views after having Unclassified students in class.

Academic performance of Unclassified Students should be continuously monitored, in order to maintain the high academic standards of the University of Alberta.

More research on student attitudes and recommendations is warranted. Both as a public relations effort, and to assess needs and institutional opportunities, students should be surveyed on a regular basis. Although it has been established that mature and non-traditional students have specialized needs and problems, it should be noted that traditional students too should be studied and consulted. Perhaps there are other sub-groups with specialized needs that have not been recognized. As noted in the literature, continuous research on students and the community aids the institution in becoming more responsive to those needs.

References

Alberta Advanced Education
1984 Participation Patterns Study. Report of the Committee to examine participation trends of Alberta post-secondary students. Planning Secretariat, June.

Anisef, Paul and Norman Okihiro
1982 Losers and winners. Toronto: Butterworths.

Austin, H.S.
1976 "Continuing education and the development of adult women." Counseling Psychologist, 6 : 59-60.

Bauer, William K.
1981 "Strategies for recruiting and retaining the nontraditional student." College Student Journal 15 (3), 234-38.

Blackburn, James C.
1980 "Marketing and selective admissions." Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, 24 (3), 25-28.

Borich, Gary D.
1977 "Program Evaluation: new concepts, new methods." Focus on Exceptional Children, 9 (3) : 1-16.

Brydon, Charles W.
1978 "A case for open enrollment." Community College Review, 6 (2), 29-33.

Burkett, J.E.
1977 "Higher education's growing edge." Educational Record, 58 (3), 259-269.

Cheney, George and Jerry F. Buss
1980 "Locating non-traditional students in community organizations." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 17 (3), 2-8.

Daniel, Carter A.
1981 "The myopic marketers of academe." Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counsellors, 25 (1), 43-44.

Davis, Jerry S. and Kingston Johns Jr.
1982 "Low faculty income: a continuing barrier to college enrollment?". Journal of Student Financial Aid, 12 (1) 5-10.

Groves, Sandra L., and David L. Groves
1980 "The faculty's perception of the mature adult: a case study." Alternative Higher Education: The Journal of Nontraditional Studies, 5 (2), 106-111.

Hartnagel, Douglas and Jeanne Union
1981 "Admissions and the non-traditional student." Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, 25 (4), 9-13.

Holley, Freda M., Paula Matuszek, and J. Curtis
1979 Dare we ask? New ways to look at evaluation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

House, Ernest R.
1978 "Assumptions Underlying evaluation models." Educational Researcher, March, 1978, 4-12.

Kim, Lillemor
1979 "Widened admission to higher education in Sweden." European Journal of Education, 14 (2), 181-192.

Kirk, Pauline
1977 "The tip of the iceberg: some effects of open university study on married students" Teaching at a Distance, 10 (19-27).

Knights, S. and R. McDonald
1982 "Adult learners in higher education: some study problems and solutions from Australian experience. British Journal of Educational

Technology, 13 (3), 237-246.

Leaf, Jeanette B.
1979 "A new perspective on college admissions testing." College Student Journal, 13 (1), 69-72.

MacDonald, Barry
1974 Evaluation and the control of education, Ford Foundation Safari Project, University of East Anglia.

Macdonald, H. Ian
1982 Introduction to Losers and winners by Paul Anisef and Norman Okihiro. Toronto: Butterworths.

McCabe, Robert H.
1981 "Now is the time to reform the American community college." Community and Junior College Journal, 51 (8), 6-10.

Miles, William R.
1981 "Illuminative evaluation for formative decision-making." Evaluation Review: 5 (4), 479-499.

Morrison, A.A.
1979 "New start: pre-enrollment program for mature age students." Australian Journal of Adult Education, 19 (1), 13-17.

Oski, Katharine
1980 "Problems and issues raised by returning adults." Alternative Higher Education: The Journal of Nontraditional Studies, 5 (2), 100-105.

Parlett, Malcolm and David Hamilton
1972 Evaluation as illumination: a new approach to the study of innovatory programmes. Occasional Paper 9, Centre for Research in the Educational Sciences, University of Edinburgh.

Patton, M.Q.
1978 Utilization-focused evaluation. Beverly Hills : Sage Publications.

Pike, Robert S.
1978 Innovation in access to higher education. New York: International Council for Educational Development.

Pike, Robert
1970 Who doesn't get to university and why. Ottawa: Runge Press.

Rachlis, Lorne
1981 "Addressing the needs of returning adult students." Clearing House, 54 (8), 376-380.

Rawlins, M.E.
1979 "Life made easier for the over-thirty undergrads." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 58 (2), 139-143.

Reehling, Jean E.
1980 "They are returning, but are they staying?" Journal of College Student Personnel, 21 (6), 491-497.

Scott, Robert A.
1978 "Open admissions : a reply to the critics." Higher Education Review, 11 (1), 51-70.

Scriven, Michael
1980 Evaluation thesaurus. California : Edgepress.

Sikula, Roberta A.
1979 "Can the academically under-prepared adult complete university courses successfully?" College Student Journal, 13 (1), 5-8.

Stake, Robert E.
1967 "The countenance of educational evaluation." Teachers College Record : 68, 523-540.

Stewart, Charles J. Jr., and Kate Avery
1978 "College enrollment in response to fluctuations in unemployment and income." College and University, 53 (3), 301-313.

Streeter, Richard B.
1980 "Alternative financial resources for the non-traditional student". Journal of Student Financial Aid, 10 (2) p. 17-22.

Taylor, Clark
1982 "A welcome for diversely prepared students." New Directions for Experiential Learning, :17, 5-15.

University of Alberta
1983 Report of the Task Force on Mature Students. The Senate.

Vincent, William E.
1981 "In support of open admissions." Community and Junior College Journal, 52 (4), 12-13.

Weiss, C.H.
1972 Evaluation research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Willie, Charles V.
1982 "Educating students who are good enough: is excellence an excuse to exclude?" Change, 14 (2), 16-20.

Worthen, Blaine and Sanders
1973 Educational evaluation: theory and practice. Worthington, Ohio. C.A. Jones Publ. Co. Ltd.

Yarrington, Roger
1981 "Questioning the community college." Change, 13 (5), 34-35.

Zelmer, A.
1982 Non-Program Students. A proposal submitted to Deans and Department Chairmen, University of Alberta. May 26.

APPENDIX A

The Senate
The University of Alberta

Two Athabasca Hall
Edmonton, Alberta
[illegible]
Telephone [illegible]

February 1983

TASK FORCE ON MATURE STUDENTS

The Senate Task Force on Mature Students is charged with the responsibility of determining the kinds of problems which affect mature students' decisions to enter the University of Alberta, as well as the special difficulties they may experience while in attendance.

It is anticipated that the Task Force will make recommendations which hopefully will enhance the opportunities for mature persons to pursue a university education.

The Task Force feels that, as one of the first students to take advantage of the new Unclassified Registration category, you could add considerably to our knowledge. For that reason, we are asking you to complete the following questionnaire and to return it as soon as possible, preferably before March 1, 1983, so that we may include your responses in our report in April to The Senate.

Thank you for participating in the study. Your efforts in helping make the University more accessible to the public are very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Marguerite Trussler, Chairperson
Task Force on Mature Students

****

QUESTIONNAIRE - UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS

SECTION ONE: Questions in this section deal with background information. Please circle the number of the appropriate response, or write in the blank provided.

Office use only

1. What is your present age?

_____years 1)__ __

2. Your sex? 1. male 2. female 3)__

(over.....)

QUESTIONNAIRE U/C
page 2

3. What is your current marital status?

1. single 2. married 3. common-law
4. separated, divorced 5. widowed

4. Do you have homemaking responsibilities?

1. none 2. self only 3. few 4. many

5. Do you have children at home?

1. none 2. preschoolers (how many____) 3. aged 5 to 14 (how many____) 4. aged 15 or older (how many____)

6. Before coming to the University of Alberta, what was the highest level of education which you had completed?

1. some high school
2. high school matriculation
3. some university
4. university degree
5. some community college or technical institute
6. graduate of community college or technical institute

7. Have you ever taken a University of Alberta Extension course?

1. no 2. one 3. more than one

8. Apart from the time for your university course, how is the majority of your time spent?

1. full time job 2. homemaker 3. part time job
4. volunteer work 5. student at another institution
6. other (please specify)_____

Office use only

4)___
5)___
6)___
7)___
8)___
9)___
10)___
11)___

SECTION TWO: The following questions relate to the University of Alberta. Please circle the number of the appropriate response or write in the blank provided.

1. How did you learn about the Unclassified Student category?

1. newspaper 2. word of mouth 3. University publication
4. Registrar's Office 5. other

2. Why did you choose to enroll as an Unclassified Student, rather than in a regular degree program?

_____

_____

3. In which term did you take a course? (circle two if applicable)

1. Sept. to Dec. 2. Jan. to April 3. full year course

4. What grade did you receive?

4 5 6 7 8 9 n/a

5. Have you dropped a course?

1. no 2. in fall term 3. in winter term

6. Has your academic performance been what you expected?

1. better than expected 2. about what expected 3. not up to expectations

7. Do you plan to transfer courses completed as an Unclassified Student to another University program? 1. yes 2. no

8. If so, which faculty interests you?

Faculty of_____

12)___
13)___
14)___
15)___
16)___
17)___
18)___
19)___
20)___
21)___
22)___
23)___ ___
24)___ ___

SECTION THREE: Please read the three statements below, AA, BB and CC, and answer the appropriate set of questions which follow, and which are most applicable to your circumstances.

AA If you previously APPLIED to the University of Alberta but did not attend, what were the reasons? PLEASE COMPLETE SECTION AA.

or

BB If you previously had THOUGHT about coming to the University of Alberta but did not apply, what were the reasons? PLEASE COMPLETE SECTION BB.

or

CC All others: What influenced your decision to enroll as an Unclassified Student? (If you chose CC, this is the last question, and we thank you for your co-operation.)

_____

_____

_____

SECTION AA "PREVIOUSLY APPLIED BUT DID NOT ATTEND"

Please examine the reasons listed below, and in each category place a 1 beside the major reason you did not attend. If there was more than one problem, place a 2, 3 etc. in the space beside those other factors which influenced your decision. If there was a circumstance affecting your decision which is not listed, please include it in the space provided.

BARRIERS TO ENTRY - by University

___ did not meet admission requirements
___ difficulties obtaining information from the University of Alberta
___ inadequate academic counselling
___ inadequate choice of courses at convenient times
___ rigid residency requirements
___ registration process too cumbersome
___ difficulties with transfer of credits from other university or college
___ not accepted to Quota faculty

Other: _____

BARRIERS TO ENTRY - Situational

___ time pressures
___ balancing multiple responsibilities
___ financial difficulties
___ health problems
___ unavailability of child care
___ transportation difficulties
___ lack of encouragement from family or peers
___ disruption of family life

Other: _____

BARRIERS TO ENTRY - Personal

___ lack of motivation
___ lack of confidence
___ feelings of isolation (would not know anybody)
___ concern about academic competence (writing exams, essays)
___ Other _____

Office use only

27)___
28___
29)___
30)___
31)___
32)___
33)___
34)___
35)___
36)___
37)___
38)___
39)___
40)___
41)___
42)___
43)___
44)___
45)___
46)___
47)___
48)___
49)___
50)___
51)___

SECTION BB "THOUGHT ABOUT COMING TO UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA BUT DID NOT APPLY"

Please examine the reasons listed below, and in each category place a 1 beside the major reason you did not apply. If there was more than one problem, place a 2, 3, etc.. in the space beside those other factors which influenced your decision. If there was a circumstance affecting your decision which is not listed, please include it in the space provided.

BARRIERS - by University

Office use only

___ concerned that I could not meet admission requirements — 52)___
___ difficulty obtaining information from Registrar's Office — 53)___
___ difficulty obtaining information from faculty offices — 54)___
___ inadequate choice of courses at convenient times — 55)___
___ heard that registration process was too cumbersome — 56)___
___ did not think I would get credit for studies taken at another postsecondary institution — 57)___
___ Other:_____ — 58)___
59)___

BARRIERS - Situational

___ time pressures
___ balancing multiple responsibilities — 60)___
___ financial difficulties — 61)___
___ health problems — 62)___
___ unavailability of child care — 63)___
___ transportation difficulties — 64)___
___ lack of encouragement from family or peers — 65)___
___ expected disruption of family life — 66)___
___ Other:_____ — 67)___
68)___

BARRIERS - Personal — 69)___

___ lack of motivation
___ lack of confidence — 70)___
___ expected feeling of isolation (would not know anybody) — 71)___
___ concern about academic competence (writing exams, essays) — 72)___
___ Other:_____ — 73)___
74)___
75)___

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION.
PLEASE MAIL IN ENVELOPE PROVIDED.

APPENDIX B

HELLO, IS THIS _____? MY NAME IS LAURIE JACKSON AND I''M CALLING FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA.

YOU WERE AN UNCLASSIFIED STUDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY IN THE 1982-83 TERM, AM I CORRECT? ____(pause)

THE UNIVERSITY IS NOW EVALUATING THIS REGISTRATION ARRANGEMENT TO SEE WHETHER IT SHOULD BE KEPT, CHANGED OR DISCONTINUED.

PERHAPS YOU RECALL A MAIL SURVEY WHICH WAS SENT OUT LAST FEBRUARY BY THE SENATE TASK FORCE ON MATURE STUDENTS? THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION HAS NOW ASKED ME TO DO A FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW ON LAST YEAR'S UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS TO SEE WHAT THEY ARE NOW DOING AND TO FIND OUT WHAT THEIR IMPRESSIONS OF THE ARRANGEMENT WERE.

WOULD YOU ANSWER A FEW QUESTIONS FOR ME? THE ENTIRE INTERVIEW WILL TAKE LESS THAN FIVE MINUTES.

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW

1. HOW MANY COURSES HAVE YOU COMPLETED AS AN UNCLASSIFIED STUDENT ? _____

2. WERE YOU SATISFIED WITH YOUR EXPERIENCE AS AN UNCLASSIFIED STUDENT ? _____
(PROBE WHY OR WHY NOT) _____

3. DID YOU APPLY FOR ADMISSION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA FOR THE 1983-84 TERM ?
NO ☐ YES ☐

4. WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS?

5. DID YOU APPLY:
TO A FACULTY ☐ ☐ AS UNCLASSIFIED

6. WHICH ONE ?

7. WERE YOU ACCEPTED ? ____

8. ARE YOU CURRENTLY REGISTERED? ____
☐ FULL TIME ☐ PART TIME

9. DO YOU HAVE ANY PLANS FOR ATTENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA IN THE FUTURE ?
NO ☐ YES ☐
OUTLINE REASONS
OUTLINE PLANS

10. DO YOU HAVE PLANS FOR ATTENDING ANY OTHER POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS ? ____ IF YES, SPECIFY _____

11. BASED ON YOUR EXPERIENCE, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE UNIVERSITY SHOULD MAINTAIN THE UNCLASSIFIED REGISTRATION OPTION ? (PROBE WHY OR WHY NOT)

APPENDIX C

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA
T6G 2G5

February, 1984

Dear Student:

Your experience and impressions as an Unclassified Student are of interest to the University for their evaluation of this registration option.

I am a graduate student of Educational Administration and have been asked by the Administration of the University of Alberta to study and evaluate the Unclassified arrangement. My research is designed to supplement a study conducted last year by the University Senate Task Force on Mature Students.

The attached questionnaire was designed to determine Unclassified Students' backgrounds, experiences, and feelings regarding the University. All responses will be kept completely anonymous and confidential, but when compiled will provide valuable information to aid the University in future planning.

Please answer the attached questionnaire and return as soon as possible in the envelope provided. Thank you so much for your help. It is only through input from concerned students that the University can become more responsive to your needs.

Yours truly,

Laurie Jackson
Graduate Student

QUESTIONNAIRE - UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS

SECTION ONE: Questions in this section deal with background information. Please circle the number of the appropriate response, or write in the blank provided.

***

Office use only

1. What is your present age?

   _____ years

   1. ___ ___

2. Your sex?

   1. male 2. female

   2. _____

3. What is your current marital status?

   1. single 3. common-law 5. widowed
   2. married 4. separated, divorced

   4. _____

4. Do you have children at home?

   1. no
   2. preschoolers (how many____)
   3. aged 5 to 14 (how many?____)
   4. aged 15 or older (how many?____)

   6.(#2) _____
   7.(#3) _____
   8.(#4) _____

5. Before registering as an Unclassified Student at the University of Alberta, what was the highest level of education which you had completed?

   1. some high school
   2. high school matriculation
   3. some university
   4. university degree
   5. some community college or technical institute
   6. graduate of community college or technical institute

   9. _____

6. Have you ever taken a University of Alberta Extension course?

   1. no 2. one 3. more than one

   10. _____

7. Apart from the time for your university course, how is the majority of your time spent?

   1. full-time job
   2. homemaker
   3. part-time job
   4. volunteer work
   5. student at another institution
   6. other (please specify)

   _____

   11. _____

SECTION TWO: The following questions relate to your experiences as an Unclassified Student at the University of Alberta. Please circle the number of the appropriate response or write in the blank provided.

***

Office use only

1. How did you first learn about the Unclassified Student Category? — 12. _____

   1. newspaper
   2. word of mouth
   3. University publication
   4. Registrar's office
   5. other (specify) _____

2. Why did you choose to enroll as an Unclassifed Student, rather than in a regular degree program? — 13. _____ 14. _____ 15. _____ 16. _____

   _____

   _____

3. In which term did you take a course as an Unclassified Student? (circle two if applicable) — 17. _____ (first answer) 18. _____ (second answer if any)

   1. September to December
   2. January to April
   3. full year course

4. What grade did you receive? — 19. _____

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 n/a

5. Have you dropped a course in this school year? — 20. _____

   1. no 2. in the fall term 3. in the winter term

6. Has your academic performance been: — 21. _____

   1. better than you expected
   2. about what you expected
   3. not up to your expectations

7. Do you plan to transfer courses completed as an Unclassified Student to another University Program? — 22. _____

   1. yes 2. no

8. If so, which university and faculty interests you? — 23. ___ ___ 25. ___ ___

   University _____

   Faculty of _____

SECTION THREE: Please read the statements below, and select the one most applicable to your circumstances. Then answer the questions indicated for that part only.

***

A If you previously APPLIED for Admission to a faculty at the University of Alberta but did not attend, PLEASE COMPLETE PART A.

B If you previously had THOUGHT about a program at the University of Alberta but did not APPLY, PLEASE COMPLETE PART B.

All others, please proceed directly to SECTION FOUR.

PART A: "PREVIOUSLY APPLIED BUT DID NOT ATTEND"

Please examine the reasons listed below, and in each category place a 1 beside the major reason you did not attend. If there was more than one problem, place a 2, 3 etc. in the space beside those other factors which influenced your decision. If there was a circumstance affecting your decision which is not listed, please include it in the space provided.

Office use only

BARRIERS TO ENTRY - by University

____ did not meet admission requirements — 27. ____
____ difficulties obtaining information from the University of Alberta — 28. ____
____ inadequate academic counselling — 29. ____
____ inadequate choice of courses at convenient times — 30. ____
____ rigid residency requirements — 31. ____
____ registration process too cumbersome — 32. ____
____ difficulties with transfer of credits from other university or college — 33. ____
____ not accepted to Quota faculty — 34. ____
OTHER: _____ — 35. ____

36. ____

BARRIERS TO ENTRY - Situational

____ time pressures — 37. ____
____ balancing multiple responsibilities — 38. ____
____ financial difficulties — 39. ____
____ health problems — 40. ____
____ unavailability of child care — 41. ____
____ transportation difficulties — 42. ____
____ lack of encouragement from family or peers — 43. ____
____ disruption of family life — 44. ____
OTHER: _____

Office use only

BARRIERS TO ENTRY - Personal

____ lack of motivation — 47. _____
____ lack of confidence — 48. _____
____ feelings of isolation (would not know anybody) — 49. _____
____ concern about academic competence (writing exams, essays) — 50. _____
OTHER: _____ — 51. _____

PLEASE PROCEED TO SECTION FOUR

PART B: "THOUGHT ABOUT COMING TO UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA BUT DID NOT APPLY"

Please examine the reasons listed below, and in each category place a 1 beside the major reason you did not apply. If there was more than one problem, place a 2, 3, etc. in the space beside those other factors which influenced your decision. If there was a circumstance include it in the space provided.

***

Office use only

BARRIERS - by University

____ concerned that I could not meet admission requirements — 52. _____
____ difficulty obtaining information from Registrar's Office — 53. _____
____ difficulty obtaining information from faculty offices — 54. _____
____ inadequate choice of courses at convenient times — 55. _____
____ heard that registration process was too cumbersome — 56. _____
____ did not think I would get credit for studies taken at another postsecondary institution. — 57. _____
OTHER: _____ — 58. _____

BARRIERS - situational

____ time pressures — 58. _____
____ balancing multiple responsibilities — 59. _____
____ financial difficulties — 60. _____
____ health problems — 61. _____
____ unavailability of child care — 62. _____
____ transportation difficulties — 63. _____
____ lack of encouragement from family or peers — 64. _____
____ expected disruption of family life — 65. _____
OTHER: _____ — 66. _____

BARRIERS - personal

____ lack of motivation — 70. _____
____ lack of confidence — 71. _____
____ expected feeling of isolation (would not know anybody) — 72. _____
____ concern about academic competence (writing exams, etc.) — 73. _____
OTHER: _____ — 74. _____
75. _____

PLEASE PROCEED TO SECTION FOUR

SECTION FOUR: The following questions are designed to find your impressions and recommendations.

***

Office use only

1. Were you satisfied with your experience as an Unclassified Student? 76. _____

   1. very satisfied 2. satisfied 3. unsure
   4. dissatisfied 5. very dissatisfied 77. _____

   why or why not? _____

   _____

   _____

2. Based on your experience as an Unclassified Student, do you feel that the University of Alberta should continue this arrangement? 78. _____

   1. yes 2. no 3. unsure 79. _____

   Can you give us any recommendations? _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

Thank you very much for taking part in this study. Please place the questionnaire in the envelope provided and mail as soon as possible.

APPENDIX D

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA
T6G 2G5

February 21, 1984

Dear Unclassified Student:

Two weeks ago, I sent you a questionnaire for your input on the Unclassified program. This letter is just to serve as a reminder. If you have not already done so, please fill out the questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided. Your impressions are very important to the University in their evaluation of this registration option.

Thank you for your time.

Yours truly,

Laurie Jackson
Graduate Student

APPENDIX E

Age of Unclassified Students

Age	1982-83 Frequency	1982-83 Valid %	1983-84 Frequency	1983-84 Valid %
18	5	3.4	4	2.3
19	5	3.4	4	2.3
20	5	3.4	5	2.9
21	4	2.7	11	6.4
22	5	3.4	2	1.2
23	12	8.2	18	10.5
24	6	4.1	10	5.8
25	8	5.4	9	5.2
26	6	4.1	10	5.8
27	5	3.4	11	6.4
28	7	4.8	7	4.1
29	2	1.4	5	2.9
30	6	4.1	7	4.1
31	3	2.0	3	1.7
32	3	2.0	8	4.7
33	6	4.1	-	-
34	2	1.4	5	2.9
35	4	2.7	2	1.2
36	5	3.4	6	3.5
37	4	2.7	6	3.5
38	4	2.7	2	1.2
39	2	1.4	5	2.9
40	3	2.0	3	1.7
41	-	-	2	1.2
42	1	0.7	3	1.7
43	3	2.0	2	1.2
44	1	0.7	1	0.6
45	2	1.4	1	0.6
46	-	-	1	0.6
47	1	0.7	2	1.2
48	4	2.7	1	0.6
49	2	1.4	1	0.6
50	2	1.4	2	1.2
51	6	4.1	1	0.6
52	2	1.4	1	0.6
54	-	-	2	1.2
55	-	-	2	1.2
57	1	0.7	-	-
59	-	-	1	0.6
60	1	0.7	-	-
61	-	-	3	1.7
65	3	2.0	-	-
66	2	1.4	-	-
67	1	0.7	2	1.2
68	-	-	1	0.6
74	1	0.7	-	-
75	1	0.7	-	-
77	1	0.7	-	-

APPENDIX F

GRADES OBTAINED BY ALL STUDENTS IN GROUPS OF COURSES TAKEN BY UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS, WINTER 1982-83

GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N	MEAN	S.D.	W	WF	ABF	AB*	AU	XX*	TOTAL
Group 1																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	1	1	8	7.13	0.99	-	-	1	-	-	1	10
Others	-	3	1	5	24	40	53	25	11	162	6.54	1.38	13	-	2	-	2	2	181
Total	-	3	1	5	24	42	57	26	12	170	6.56	1.37	13	-	3	-	2	3	191
Group 2																			
Uncl	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	5	5.40	1.14	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Others	5	1	1	12	15	27	31	29	11	132	6.39	1.83	23	1	4	1	2	-	163
Total	5	1	1	13	17	28	32	29	11	137	6.35	1.82	23	1	4	1	2	-	168
Group 3																			
Uncl	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	4	5.75	3.40	1	-	-	-	-	-	5
Others	2	-	-	1	-	1	1	3	4	12	6.58	3.00	3	-	-	-	2	4	21
Total	3	-	-	1	-	2	2	3	5	16	6.38	3.01	4	-	-	-	2	4	26
Group 4																			
Uncl	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	4	5.50	2.65	-	-	-	1	-	-	5
Others	5	13	11	28	50	77	64	55	32	335	6.16	1.86	41	-	4	1	7	-	388
Total	5	14	11	28	51	77	65	56	32	339	6.15	1.87	41	-	4	2	7	-	393
Group 5																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	4	7.50	1.29	3	-	-	-	-	-	7
Others	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	2	5	7.20	2.49	7	-	-	-	1	-	13
Total	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	2	3	9	7.33	1.94	10	-	-	-	1	-	20
Group 6																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	7.50	2.12	2	-	3	-	-	-	7
Others	-	1	-	3	5	7	17	13	2	48	6.71	1.43	13	1	-	1	5	-	68
Total	-	1	-	3	5	8	17	13	3	50	6.74	1.44	15	1	3	1	5	-	75
Group 7																			
Uncl	1	-	-	1	1	3	3	-	-	9	5.44	1.94	2	-	-	-	-	3	14
Others	25	7	21	48	101	119	90	46	22	479	5.66	1.85	88	2	7	1	1	9	587
Total	26	7	21	49	102	122	93	46	22	488	5.65	1.85	90	2	7	1	1	12	601
Group 8																			
Uncl	1	2	-	-	1	1	3	-	1	9	5.11	2.80	4	-	-	-	-	2	15
Others	62	35	60	230	423	490	329	172	30	1831	5.59	1.65	268	8	16	1	13	36	2173
Total	63	37	60	230	424	491	332	172	31	1840	5.59	1.66	272	8	16	1	13	38	2188
Group 9																			
Uncl	2	-	1	3	1	6	4	2	-	19	5.37	2.06	3	-	3	-	-	-	25
Others	45	36	87	220	355	379	233	110	20	1485	5.39	1.64	222	2	29	-	17	-	1755
Total	47	36	88	223	356	385	237	112	20	1504	5.39	1.65	225	2	32	-	17	-	1780
Group 10																			
Uncl	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	4	6.75	1.89	-	-	1	-	-	-	5
Others	1	6	14	32	57	71	62	30	9	282	5.85	1.57	18	-	5	1	3	-	309
Total	1	6	14	33	57	71	63	32	9	286	5.86	1.57	18	-	6	1	3	-	314
Group 11																			
Uncl	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	4	4.25	2.87	3	-	1	-	-	-	8
Others	7	5	1	9	14	12	14	16	23	101	6.25	2.43	42	-	5	-	13	5	166
Total	8	5	1	11	14	12	14	17	23	105	6.17	2.47	45	-	6	-	13	5	174
Group 12																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	4	2	1	1	-	8	5.88	1.13	6	-	2	-	-	-	16
Others	11	10	25	101	166	165	86	41	1	606	5.39	1.45	98	-	12	-	3	-	719
Total	11	10	25	101	170	167	87	42	1	614	5.40	1.44	104	-	14	-	3	-	735

GRADES OBTAINED BY ALL STUDENTS IN GROUPS OF COURSES TAKEN BY UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS, WINTER 1982-83

GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N	MEAN	S.D.	W	WF	ABF	AB*	AU	XX*	TOTAL
Group 13																			
Uncl	2	1	-	-	1	2	2	1	-	9	4.78	2.73	2	-	1	-	-	-	12
Others	20	21	29	82	168	211	107	56	5	699	5.47	1.59	67	-	16	-	8	-	790
Total	22	22	29	82	169	213	109	57	5	708	5.46	1.61	69	-	17	-	8	-	802
Group 14																			
Uncl	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	5	4.40	3.85	1	-	1	-	-	-	7
Others	10	19	22	38	75	86	106	63	42	461	6.03	1.93	119	2	8	-	14	-	604
Total	12	19	23	38	75	86	106	64	43	466	6.02	1.96	120	2	9	-	14	-	611
Group 15																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	1	-	5	6.00	1.22	1	-	-	-	-	-	6
Others	2	5	2	13	47	101	98	35	4	307	6.23	1.28	38	1	12	-	5	-	363
Total	2	5	2	13	49	103	98	36	4	312	6.23	1.28	39	1	12	-	5	-	369
Group 16																			
Uncl	2	1	2	2	4	4	1	1	-	17	4.53	2.00	2	-	2	-	-	-	21
Others	3	7	12	40	93	140	111	78	20	504	6.15	1.51	62	1	6	-	5	-	578
Total	5	8	14	42	97	144	112	79	20	521	6.10	1.55	64	1	8	-	5	-	599
Group 17																			
Uncl	1	1	1	-	2	1	4	2	-	12	5.50	2.35	-	-	1	-	-	-	13
Others	5	3	10	26	59	104	118	79	17	421	6.35	1.51	41	-	23	-	5	-	490
Total	6	4	11	26	61	105	122	81	17	433	6.33	1.54	41	-	24	-	5	-	503
Group 18																			
Uncl	-	-	1	-	2	7	3	3	1	17	6.41	1.42	1	-	-	-	-	-	18
Others	17	24	38	156	313	365	343	202	76	1534	6.04	1.60	72	-	15	1	6	-	1628
Total	17	24	39	156	315	372	346	205	77	1551	6.04	1.60	73	-	15	1	6	-	1646
Group 19																			
Uncl	-	1	-	-	2	3	3	2	1	12	6.33	1.83	1	-	-	-	-	2	15
Others	4	7	9	44	128	289	271	134	21	907	6.34	1.28	66	1	6	1	-	11	992
Total	4	8	9	44	130	292	274	136	22	919	6.34	1.29	67	1	6	1	-	13	1007
Group 20																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	4	7.25	0.50	-	-	1	-	-	-	5
Others	-	6	10	38	71	244	204	124	33	730	6.48	1.30	33	-	11	-	1	-	775
Total	-	6	10	38	71	244	207	125	33	734	6.48	1.30	33	-	12	-	1	-	780
Group 21																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	-	-	5	6.00	1.00	1	-	1	-	-	-	7
Others	5	8	24	73	163	261	224	88	23	869	6.04	1.40	43	-	8	-	1	-	921
Total	5	8	24	73	165	262	226	88	23	874	6.04	1.40	44	-	9	-	1	-	928
Group 22																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	3	5.67	0.58	2	-	-	-	-	-	5
Others	-	1	1	4	18	39	34	11	4	112	6.31	1.21	10	-	2	-	6	-	130
Total	-	1	1	4	19	41	34	11	4	115	6.30	1.20	12	-	2	-	6	-	135
Group 23																			
Uncl	2	4	6	9	8	5	9	4	3	50	5.12	2.14	3	-	3	-	-	-	56
Others	52	63	113	319	454	737	624	365	133	2860	5.93	1.71	166	3	27	5	7	1	3069
Total	54	67	119	328	462	742	633	369	136	2910	5.92	1.72	169	3	30	5	7	1	3125
Group 24																			
Uncl	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	5	4.20	2.28	2	-	-	-	-	-	7
Others	3	5	-	15	40	91	101	65	24	344	6.58	1.45	30	-	6	-	3	-	383
Total	3	7	-	16	40	92	102	65	24	349	6.54	1.48	32	-	6	-	3	-	390

GRADES OBTAINED BY ALL STUDENTS IN GROUPS OF COURSES TAKEN BY UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS, WINTER 1982-83

GROUP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N	MEAN	S.D.	W	WF	ABF	AB*	AU	XX*	TOTAL
Group 25																			
Uncl	-	-	-	1	3	1	2	2	-	9	6.11	1.45	1	-	-	-	-	-	10
Others	-	3	3	20	37	62	64	72	22	283	6.62	1.50	26	-	1	-	4	1	315
Total	-	3	3	21	40	63	66	74	22	292	6.61	1.50	27	-	1	-	4	1	325
Group 26																			
Uncl	1	1	-	-	3	5	6	4	2	22	6.36	1.97	3	-	3	-	-	-	28
Others	89	120	204	590	1193	1971	1751	1024	287	7229	6.10	1.57	699	4	84	12	82	5	8115
Total	90	121	204	590	1196	1976	1757	1028	289	7251	6.10	1.57	702	4	87	12	82	5	8143
Group 27																			
Uncl	1	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	-	6	4.50	1.97	-	-	2	-	-	-	8
Others	14	11	27	75	160	187	169	93	36	772	5.95	1.65	88	-	14	4	11	1	890
Total	15	11	27	77	160	190	169	93	36	778	5.93	1.65	88	-	16	4	11	1	898
Group 28																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	4	1	9	7.33	1.22	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
Others	-	-	-	2	4	11	11	23	5	56	7.14	1.26	7	-	1	-	2	-	66
Total	-	-	-	2	5	12	13	27	6	65	7.17	1.24	7	-	1	-	2	-	75
Group 29																			
Uncl	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	5.00	1.41	3	-	-	-	-	-	5
Others	2	6	7	30	62	77	88	45	13	330	6.12	1.53	32	-	2	2	6	-	372
Total	2	6	7	31	62	78	88	45	13	332	6.11	1.53	35	-	2	2	6	-	377
Group 30																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	4	6.00	1.15	1	-	-	-	-	-	5
Others	6	11	14	28	59	105	99	44	11	377	5.97	1.63	58	-	3	-	9	2	449
Total	6	11	14	28	61	105	101	44	11	381	5.97	1.62	59	-	3	-	9	2	454
Group 31																			
Uncl	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3	-	6	7.33	0.82	-	-	1	-	1	-	8
Others	6	24	13	63	96	153	253	240	156	1004	6.81	1.72	107	-	13	1	17	-	1142
Total	6	24	13	63	96	154	255	243	156	1010	6.81	1.71	107	-	14	1	18	-	1150
Group 32																			
Uncl	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	5	6.40	1.52	2	-	-	-	-	-	7
Others	-	-	3	2	4	22	44	28	9	112	6.98	1.23	11	-	3	1	8	-	135
Total	-	-	3	3	4	23	46	29	9	117	6.96	1.24	13	-	3	1	8	-	142
Group 33																			
Uncl	-	-	-	2	1	4	1	7	1	16	6.81	1.56	2	-	5	-	-	-	23
Others	27	30	85	198	415	569	522	275	114	2235	6.04	1.61	113	2	10	3	22	1	2386
Total	27	30	85	200	416	573	523	282	115	2251	6.05	1.61	115	2	15	3	22	1	2409
Group 34																			
Uncl	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	5.50	2.12	1	-	3	-	-	-	6
Others	8	8	19	55	106	140	123	65	17	541	5.92	1.59	64	1	7	4	4	-	621
Total	8	8	19	56	106	140	124	65	17	543	5.92	1.59	65	1	10	4	4	-	627
Group 35																			
Uncl	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	3	4.67	2.52	-	-	2	-	-	-	5
Others	5	36	57	111	184	271	202	121	49	1036	5.85	1.69	81	1	16	3	9	-	1146
Total	5	37	57	111	185	271	203	121	49	1039	5.85	1.69	81	1	18	3	9	-	1151
Group 36																			
Uncl	-	-	-	1	2	2	2	-	-	7	5.71	1.11	2	-	-	-	-	-	9
Others	124	275	323	646	828	913	765	509	301	4684	5.55	1.98	502	14	161	23	111	3	5498
Total	124	275	323	647	830	915	767	509	301	4691	5.55	1.98	504	14	161	23	111	3	5507

COURSES TAKEN IN 82-83 BY UNCLASSIFIED STUDENTS
PROPOSED GROUPINGS

GROUP	#UN	FAC	DEPT	COURSE
1	10	AR	094	ANTHR202
2	5	AR	094	ANTHR250
3	5	AR	195	ARAB 100
4	5	AR	195	CLASS202
5	7	AR	195	HEB 100
6	7	AR	260	JAPAN100
7	14	AR	375	ENGL 200
8	15	AR	375	ENGL 210
9	25	AR	375	ENGL 215
10	5	AR	435	GEOG 251
11	8	AR	454	GERM 100
12	16	AR	465	HIST 278
13	12	AR	465	HIST 279
14	7	AR	690	PHIL 221
15	6	AR	690	PHIL 230
16	21	AR	780	POL S201
17	13	AR	780	POL S202
18	18	AR	825	PSYCO261
19	15	AR	855	SOC 202
20	5	ED	315	EDFDN201
21	7	ED	330	EDPSY263
22	5	ED	330	EDPSY341
23	56	SC	825	PSYCO260
24	7	SC	945	BIOL 210
25	4	AG	090	AN SC210
25	1	AG	390	ENT 209
25	2	AG	405	FD SC200
25	2	AG	412	FOR 200
25	1	AG	846	AG EC203
26	1	AR	094	ANTHR307
26	1	AR	098	ART H251
26	1	AR	218	C LIT202
26	1	AR	259	DRAMA249
26	3	AR	263	ECON 201
26	1	AR	263	ECON 202
26	1	AR	375	ENGL 275
26	1	AR	375	ENGL 284
26	1	AR	375	ENGL 374
26	2	AR	454	GERM 102
26	1	AR	454	SCAND100
26	1	AR	690	PHIL 239
26	1	AR	690	PHIL 323
26	1	AR	780	POL S322
26	1	AR	780	POL S361
26	2	AR	780	POL S363
26	1	AR	825	PSYCO353
26	1	AR	852	RUSS 100
26	2	AR	852	UKR 100
26	2	AR	855	SOC 301
26	1	AR	855	SOC 321
26	1	AR	855	SOC 324
27	1	AR	195	CLASS201
27	1	AR	195	CLASS231
27	1	AR	195	CLASS241
27	1	AR	195	CLASS250
27	1	AR	195	CLASS251

27	1	AR	195	CLASS260
27	1	AR	195	GREEK100
27	1	AR	195	LATIN100
28	2	AR	260	CHINA100
28	2	AR	260	CHINA300
28	4	AR	260	JAPAN201
28	1	AR	260	JAPAN202
29	3	AR	435	GEOG 250
29	1	AR	435	GEOG 364
29	1	AR	435	GEOG 382
30	2	AR	465	HIST 200
30	1	AR	465	HIST 202
30	1	AR	465	HIST 291
30	1	AR	465	HIST 376
31	2	AR	585	MUSIC200
31	3	AR	585	MUSIC206
31	2	AR	585	MUSIC207
31	1	AR	585	MUSIC304
32	1	AR	842	RELIG202
32	3	AR	842	RELIG204
32	1	AR	842	RELIG332
32	1	AR	842	RELIG347
32	1	AR	842	RELIG355
33	1	ED	315	EDFDN422
33	1	EN	525	ENGG 230
33	1	EN	570	MNL E352
33	2	HE	395	FAM 340
33	1	HE	395	FAM 347
33	4	ME	660	PMCOL222
33	2	PE	575	MOV 201
33	1	PE	575	MOV 301
33	1	PE	705	P ED 302
33	1	RM	618	OCCTH208
33	1	RM	710	PTHER311
33	2	SA	197	ADRAM243
33	1	SA	197	HISTE278
33	1	SA	197	SC PO201
33	3	SJ	885	CHR T351
34	4	SC	435	GEOG 230
34	2	SC	435	GEOG 449
35	2	SC	450	GEOL 202
35	1	SC	490	BIOL 296
35	2	SC	505	LING 303
36	1	SC	510	MATH 202
36	2	SC	510	MATH 203
36	1	SC	510	MATH 221
36	1	SC	510	MATH 240
36	1	SC	510	MATH 312
36	1	SC	510	MATH 315
36	1	SC	735	PHYS 231
36	1	SC	735	PHYS 269